DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 217 95 EA 009 918

AUTHOR Noddings, Nel
TITLE A Report of the NIE Curriculum Development Conference (Washington, D.C., November 17-19, 1976).
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 175p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Government; *Government Role
IDENTIFIERS *National Institute of Education

ABSTRACT

This publication reports on the National Institute of Education (NIE) Curriculum Development Conference, which was held November 17-19, 1976 in Washington, D.C. Purpose of the conference was to discuss important issues in education, with particular attention to the federal role in curriculum development, and to lay the foundation for a set of curriculum development policies for NIE. Section 1 of the report describes the background and organization of the conference, as well as the focus of the report. Section 2 discusses the three themes of the conference: the role of the school in a pluralistic and changing society; the need, desire, and right to participate; and problems of curriculum. Section 3 presents a session-by-session chronological account of the conference. Section 4 contains the conference's recommendations to NIE, as well as the rationale for those recommendations. The appendix contains a list of conference participants, the recommendations of individual conference participants to NIE, and a copy of NIE's curriculum policy summary. (JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144217

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A REPORT

of the

NIE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE

November 17, 18, 19, 1976

Washington, D. C.

Prepared for NIE by Nel Noddings

Los Altos, California

EA 009 918

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the Conference 1

Organization of the Conference 3

Focus of The Report 8

II THEMES OF THE CONFERENCE 10

The Role of the School in a Pluralistic and Changing Society 10

The Need, Desire, and Right to Participate 18

Problems of Curriculum 28

III A CHRONOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CONFERENCE 34

Introductory Session, Wednesday 34

Wednesday Morning: Session 2 35

Afternoon: Session 1 42

: Session 2 47

: Summary Session 51

Thursday Morning: Session 1 54

: Session 2 58

Afternoon: Session 1 62

: Session 2 68

: Summary Session 73

Friday Morning 76

Afternoon 80

IV RECOMMENDATIONS TO NIE 91

V APPENDICES 102

A. Participants 102
B. Designated Central Table Participants 105
C. Individual Recommendations to NIE 110
D. "NIE Curriculum Policy Summary" from NIE Curriculum Policy Discussion Guides 163

I INTRODUCTION

Background of the Conference

NIE's Curriculum Development Conference convened on November 17 at the Dupont Plaza Hotel in Washington, D. C. under the chairmanship of Dr. Ralph Tyler. The Conference was an integral part of the planned activities of NIE's Curriculum Development Task Force which had been in action since December, 1975. Readers interested in the history of NIE's involvement in curriculum development and, in particular, in the purposes and activities of its Curriculum Development Task Force, should consult the NIE report Current Issues, Problems, and Concerns in Curriculum Development.*

In September, 1975, NIE's governing body, the National Council on Educational Research, requested that NIE, in conjunction with others, make arrangements

> for the preparation of contending, informed "briefs" on the value of curriculum change as an aid to schools, for systematic public discussion of the briefs, and for the preparation of recommendations to the Federal government on future funding policy in this area.

In keeping with the spirit of the charge, NIE established the Curriculum Development Task Force, and Jon Schaffarzick was appointed its chairman.

As part of its effort in assisting NCER to formulate policy, the Task Force commissioned thirty papers by a variety of scholars, policy analysts, curriculum developers, and spokesmen for particular

---

*Available from Jon Schaffarzick and Gary Sykes, NIE Curriculum Development Task Force, National Institute of Education, 1200 19th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20208

viewpoints.* It also has met with approximately forty groups of parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, publishers, etc., in various parts of the country in order to collect views and advice to pass along to NCER. The Guides for Public Discussion, which were prepared to facilitate these discussions, are available for inspection.** The November Conference represents a third major strand in NIE's effort to collect information for responsible policy making.

The Conference had two main purposes: (1) to provide needed discussion of some important current issues in education generally, in curriculum development more specifically, and in the Federal role in curriculum development even more specifically, and (2) to lay the foundation for a set of sound, sensible curriculum development policies for NIE. It should be clear, then,--and this is a point Chairman Ralph Tyler emphasized repeatedly--that the Conference participants were not expected to achieve consensus on either problem identification or recommendations to NIE. Rather, the expectation was that the discussion would, in Tyler's words, provide "illumination and clarification" of problems and questions in the field of curriculum and in the area of Federal participation.

In order to achieve some unity and integration of effort among its parallel strands, NIE provided conference participants with copies of

---

*Abstracts of the commissioned papers are available from the Task Force.

**The summary guide appears in Appendix D. Full sets of the guides are available from the Task Force.

the commissioned papers and with the Discussion Guides. Thus, it was hoped that conference participants who represented a wide variety of interests and competencies would express opinions and provide advice both on matters likely to arise at regional conferences and on subjects raised by the paper writers. Although many of the paper writers were present, it was not intended that the conference sessions should be limited to--or even centered upon--the prepared papers. Indeed, this intention was fulfilled; the papers represented a valuable resource for discussion but were not used to direct discussion.

Organization of the Conference

Since the result of the Conference was to be "illumination and clarification," it was decided that all sessions would be general meetings involving all of the participants. At each session a dozen or so participants were invited (or volunteered) to sit at a central table and initiate discussion on the topic question. After about an hour of "central table talk," all participants were invited to engage in the discussion. While this plan of operation guided the proceedings throughout, as things moved along, it became increasingly the case that all present participated freely, under the direction of moderator Tyler, right from the start of a session. The following agenda provided the structure of the Conference.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17

9:00- 9:30 Introduction

9:30-11:30 Discussion: What social, political, and legal forces influence the curriculum and curriculum activities?

(The NIE Curriculum Development Task Force has commissioned 30 papers by scholars, policy analysts, and experienced curriculum developers. Some of these papers are especially relevant to particular topics on the conference agenda. Therefore, under many of these topics we will list those papers that contain the most pertinent information and that provide a better indication of the sorts of questions we expect to be addressed in each discussion.

In preparing for the discussion of this topic (9:30-11:30, Wednesday), please read the papers by William Boyd, Larry Cuban, Tyll van Geel, and John Wirt and Suzanne Quick. The Wirt/Quick paper was not mentioned on the list of 30 we sent you earlier.)

11:30- 1:00 Lunch

1:00- 2:30 Discussion: What are the alternative ways of developing curricula?

(See the papers by Decker Walker, Herbert Kliebard, and those in the third set ["lessons" learned from experience].)

2:30- 2:45 Break

2:45- 4:15 Discussion: What are and have been the roles of the Federal government in curriculum development?

(See the papers by Marjorie Gardner and Herbert Kliebard.)

4:15- 4:30 Break

4:30- 5:30 Opportunity for those who will not be returning on Thursday or Friday to express their main observations and policy recommendations. Discussion of those remarks by other participants.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18

9:00-10:30 Discussion: What are American children learning now? Where are they learning it?

- What are the relationships between what happens to children in schools and what happens to them elsewhere?
- What does research indicate can be accomplished through the school curriculum?
- What outcomes should we be attempting to accomplish through the school curriculum?
- What should be left to be accomplished in other settings?
- What outcomes should be the joint responsibility of the schools, the family, the churches, and other educational settings?

10:30-10:45 Break

10:45-12:15 Discussion: What kinds of educational improvements are perceived as needed now?

- Who now perceives what needs?
- What are the bases for these perceptions?
- Are some of these bases sounder than others?
- Which of these perceived needs are likely to be longer term, more universal and lasting?

(See the papers in the second set [the policy analyses] and in the third set ["lessons" from experience].)

12:15- 1:30 Lunch

1:30- 3:00 Discussion: To what extent must the identification of educational needs be a political process? To what extent does it involve a clarification of basic national values? To what extent can and should it be an objective process?

- What types of technical mechanisms might be used to monitor the quality of education and to determine needs for improvement?
- Who should do what in determining educational problems and needs?
- How can apparent conflicts in perceptions of problems and needs be reconciled?

(See the papers by Ralph Tyler, William Boyd, those in the second set [the policy analyses], and those in the third set ["lessons" from experience].)

3:00- 3:15 Break

3:15- 4:45 Discussion: How can educational development activities contribute to achieving needed educational improvements?

- What kinds of development are there? Which are most needed now?
- How can curriculum development contribute to the needed improvements?
- How can research contribute to the needed improvements?
- Is it possible/desirable to have a coherent ongoing program of educational development, rather than discrete development projects established in response to particular crises?

(See the papers by Ralph Tyler, Decker Walker, and those in the second set [the policy analyses].)

4:45- 5:45 Opportunity for those who will not be returning on Friday to express their main observations and policy recommendations. Discussion of those remarks by other participants.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19

9:00-10:30 — Discussion: Who can and should do what in curriculum development?

- Who is currently doing what?
- What are the best ways of doing curriculum development?
- Who should do what in each phase of curriculum development?

(See the papers by Decker Walker, William Boyd, Tyll van Geel, those in the second set [the policy analyses], and those in third set ["lessons" from experience].)

10:30-10:45 — Break

10:45-12:15 — Summary of main points emerging from the conference's discussions.

- Session will begin with a preliminary statement of main points (overriding observations, recommendations, conclusions, points of consensus, main alternative views where consensus was not reached) by the Chairman.

- All participants will be given an opportunity to respond: How accurate is the Chairman's summary statement? What main points have been overlooked? Are there other especially significant points that have not been brought out thus far?

12:15- 1:30 — Lunch

1:30- 4:30 — Concluding discussion of NIE's curriculum development policy issues.

- What are the implications of the conference's discussion for NIE's curriculum development policies?
- What policies do the conference participants recommend?
- Generally, should Federal agencies (particularly, here, NIE) provide leadership in curriculum development or respond to the initiatives of other agencies, organizations, and groups?
- What functions should federal agencies (particularly, here, NIE) serve vis-a-vis other educational sectors (local, state, private)?

(All papers relate to this topic. See the Wirt/Quick paper in particular.)

4:30 — Adjournment

Amended Friday Agenda

By an agreement reached in Thursday afternoon discussion, it was decided to alter the Friday agenda. The first session, as initially planned, was to address the question: Who can and should do what in curriculum development? Participants agreed that the question had already been discussed rather fully, and it was decided to do the following:

I Summary of main points of the Wednesday and Thursday sessions

II Comments and suggestions on summary

III One minute readings of prepared suggestions to NIE by participants

IV Discussion on recommendations and general reflections on the Conference and its problems

Focus of the Report

Given the purposes of the Conference, it seems clear that a substantive focus cannot appear in The Report. Two deeply-felt--but possibly incompatible views--were expressed concerning this lack of focus. On the one hand, as Frank Chase expressed it, there seemed a certain "futility" in engaging so many views without an opportunity to collect or to synthesize; on the other hand, as Donald Barr put it, there was a warning for NIE in this logical longing for synthesis: "Don't treat our statements as data!" It may, then, be impossible for the writers of The Report to satisfy both the need for synthesis and the expressed desire that individual statements stand in their full integrity. Since there was

indeed no actual synthesis, none can, in honesty, appear here. It may not offend the sense of individual integrity, however, if an attempt is made to identify a few recurring themes about which discussion frequently revolved. We shall, then, present first a thematic summary of the proceedings and, second, a chronological summary. It is hoped that the thematic summary will reveal central concerns and an outline of the logic of discussion without destroying the singularity of positions presented.

A final note on the conventions adopted for The Report: Speakers are not identified by constituency in the body of The Report. This information is readily available in the Appendices where a list of participants and their affiliation appears. It was felt that such identification in the body of The Report might induce unwarranted inferences about the reasons for a participant's statement. In fact, many participants insisted that they spoke for themselves, and that declaration has been respected.

II THEMES OF THE CONFERENCE

There seemed to be three major themes in the conference: the first, the role of the school in a pluralistic and changing society, might be characterized as primarily philosophical-ideological; the second, the need, desire, and right to participate, is, perhaps, best described as political; and, the third, problems of curriculum, may be thought of as theoretical-practical. Obviously, since the entire conference was on "curriculum," there is considerable overlap in both themes and characterizations, but the proposed classificatory scheme may help to bring some coherence to the record of the proceedings.

The Role of the School in a Pluralistic and Changing Society

Although no session of the conference was planned explicitly to consider this question and no prolonged discussion on the issue was allowed to occur, it is clear that differences of opinion about what the role of the school should be with respect to change and, in particular, with respect to changes in values, underlay much of the argumentation. The comments made in this area were often illustrative of classic positions. Peter Dow, for example, suggested that a primary role of education is subversion, that clear social policy is needed to guide curriculum development which will promote this subversion, and that value change is the essential element in subversive education.

Some were wary of this position. Donald Barr, for example, warned that there is some arrogance in an attitude which presumes to judge which long-accepted values should be subverted and that there is an abuse of parents' rights in attempts to use curricula to move children away from the values their parents advocate. In a series of

remarks on this topic, he made two points (here paraphrased): (1) The school ought not to seek change for its own sake but should somehow responsibly assess the goodness and worth of proposed change. (2) Parents have a basic moral right to evaluate the goodness of potential value changes and to support those which seem to them to merit support.

An exchange between Barr and Elliot Eisner reveals the nature of this conflict and suggests a host of others. Large parts of it are recorded here so that the reader can get a feeling for both the nature of the conflict and the flavor of debate.

Barr began by describing "two attitudes" toward curriculum--one which makes an attempt to accommodate basic rights and one which concentrates on feasibilities. As an example of curriculum development and selection which seems to concentrate on feasibilities, ignoring the issue of basic rights, he cited a Houghton-Mifflin language arts series for high school students. He then read portions of Karen Horney's Fear of Women which appears in a booklet of that series entitled, Fear. The selection represents a Freudian interpretation of the psychological fears of children with respect to sexual relationships; these fears are represented in the psyche (and described explicitly in this account) as parent-child sexual encounters. Terms for sexual anatomy are correct and explicit.

Upon completing the reading, Barr begins the dialogue.

Barr : Now, I wonder...what went on in E. Graham Ward's mind--in Moffett's mind--as they selected this?*

---

*This is not a transcript of the remarks; parts of the dialogue are omitted. It is, however, an accurate presentation of the remarks here recorded.

Eisner: ...You are concerned with the kind of values that children confront in schools, and I am concerned about that as well, but what concerns me about your orientation is that it's extraordinarily conservative.

Barr : That's bad?

Eisner here points to the "vernacular of this culture"--its variety and the cultural diversity reflected in the arts and mass media.

Eisner: If one has to take a survey to determine what it is that one is going to teach in schools that addresses itself to the existing values of the community,..., I think we're in a hopeless condition. It seems to me that educators have some responsibility to lead. It doesn't mean to foist anything down anybody's throat,...to lead,...to try to bring into one's purview in school and in the community ideas and considerations--including (those of) Karen Horney who happens to be one of the foremost theoreticians in a particular area, whether you agree with her or not.

Eisner then expresses his own willingness, as a parent, to have his children read and consider the material at issue--

Eisner: ...the kind of material you read and considered so vile.

Barr : I didn't consider it vile; I considered it inappropriate.

Eisner: Well, inappropriate. I would consider it much more appropriate than studying, in a biology course, that an insect has a head, a body, a thorax, six legs, and two antennae--which I was fed when I was a kid...I do think that people who function as

educators...have a professional responsibility to see their constituency as being not only the youngsters inside the school but people inside the community--to establish the kind of dialogue that will allow the school to provide ideas which are not now salient in the community.... I would not have wanted the curriculum that I participated in as a youngster to be determined by my parents' values, or <u>solely</u> by them, and by the range of sophistication, knowledge, sensitivity that they had,...It was much too parochial. ... I would see as a very limiting conception the idea that the community per se--the average in that community--must of necessity determine the scope and aspirations of educational programs.

Barr : ...The real question we have before us...You must not visualize the aspirations of people who themselves are not highly educated--whose vocabularies are not large, whose theology is not skeptical--you must not visualize these people as wishing to <u>deprive</u> their youngsters of anything that "goes beyond" them--quite the reverse. The great objection in Kanawha County, for example, was to the fact that the textbooks promulgated chiefly--many of them--the beauty of street language and slang and dialect. It was precisely <u>because</u> there was a lack of a literary broadening that the parents were outraged...

Barr then refers to another booklet in the same series.

Barr : It appears quite clear that the curriculum innovators' concerns were celebrating the intellectual limitations of the TV

> generation and maintaining that there was some kind of virile beauty to it. And the parents were saying: Why not Shakespeare? ...We tend in our scholarly way to assume that one broadens out, becomes higher, nobler, and richer by overcoming parental culture or parental aspirations. (But) even those of us who come from relatively uneducated homes, find it better to work within the very clearly omnipresent wish for higher and broader intellectual experience that parents have. They do not say: What was good enough for Ptolemy is good enough for me. They want their youngsters to learn a lot and to learn something very rich. ...

This dialogue which, it would seem, dramatizes a deep and perhaps irresolvable conflict in educational ideologies was terminated by a shift of topics with the next speaker. Large parts of the dialogue have been included here so that the reader might obtain some feeling for both the flavor and nature of the fears, hopes and beliefs which underlie any discussion of the role of schooling in our society and, in particular, the role of curriculum in that schooling. The chronological account of the conference (Section, III) will, perhaps, be more intelligible if one keeps in mind the fact that this basic conflict arose again and again in a variety of contexts. It is clear that the conference could neither resolve the issue nor expound upon it at length, but the conferees' comments underscored the fact that the old controversy lives: Should the professional leaders of schools lead the way to new values and a new society or should they conserve

the tried and accepted values of the existing society? Even if one denies the reality of polar instances of these positions, recognizing the range between the poles, there is still the matter of emphasis to be reckoned with when we consider the questions: What shall be taught? Who will decide?

On a seemingly nonphilosophical note, there was also considerable discussion of the realities of change in society, school, and curriculum. John Wirt commented, for example, on massive changes in elementary education; Chairman Tyler countered by noting that 60% of the elementary curriculum is still devoted to the 3 R's. George Archibald spoke, in warning tones, of the impact and coercive nature of nationally funded curriculum projects; Chairman Tyler asked simply, What impact? Several speakers referred to Larry Cuban's paper, "Determinants of Curriculum Change and Stability: 1870-1970," to support the notion that change in what is available by way of packaged curricula does not necessarily imply substantial change in curriculum at the classroom level. (One might also refer to the Wirt-Quick paper on this subject.) Hence, what looks at first glance to be a straightforward empirical question, Has the school curriculum changed? turns out to be a question which depends on how one defines curriculum and at what level one looks for change.

The reader may become increasingly aware, as the account of the conference continues, of the importance of this question for government policy makers. If nationally funded curricula have influence that verges on coercive impact, should government agencies continue the funding practice? If the curricula developed under federal funding

fail to have impact, should federal agencies be involved in attempts to effect implementation? Should the same agencies be involved in both efforts? Is there a way to fund worthwhile projects and avoid coercive impact?

As the participants moved away from the deep philosophical questions underlying the Barr-Eisner exchange toward a discussion of the empirical matters just mentioned, comments began to center on the issue of uniformity vs. diversity in curriculum. (It is not suggested that this "moving away" was a linear phenomenon; it was, rather, temporary, for participants returned again and again to deeper questions.) Why, it was asked, if the ideal in a pluralistic society is diversity, is there so much uniformity in curriculum? There followed a lengthy discussion in which participants outlined reasons for the observed uniformity and, variously, justified certain degrees of uniformity, suggested forces which might be expected to press for diversity, deplored the sluggishness of schools in producing any significant diversity, claimed both uniformity and diversity were realities,... (For details see the account of Wednesday morning's Session I.)

Some interesting attempts at clarification in the diversity/uniformity problem came late in the conference. Lawrence Senesh noted that "diversity" had been used in a variety of ways. Indeed, it would seem that it had been used in all of the following ways:

(1) to allude to an actual condition in subcultures, e.g. in customs, values, language;

(2) to describe a gross multiplicity of curricula in our schools;

(3) to refer to something missing but desirable--curricula to accomodate the diversity in subcultures;

(4) to refer to something else, also probably missing, also desirable--curricula which would tend to increase worthwhile options for students exposed to them. (the sense Senesh wished to emphasize);

(5) to describe a variety of methods or approaches which might lead to the same goal.

In discussing diversity as it is used in (3) above, John Valentine pointed out that such diversity carried to extremes can actually limit opportunities for upward mobility among affected subgroups. Some essential uniformity in h.s. curriculum is necessary, for example, if students are to be properly prepared for college. In a similar vein, Tyler noted that some uniformity is required if we are to retain a sense of national identity, and Harry Broudy warned that too much diversity (of the #3 sort) would threaten to destroy the meaning of "public" in "public schools". He saw a need for curricula which might effectively "unify the diversity."

Since Senesh introduced his important clarification so late in the conference, it is impossible to decide with certainty exactly which sense participants had in mind as they discussed the desirability of "diversity," but the reader, forewarned, can perhaps draw tentative inferences from the context of discussion.

From all this, it should be clear that, in addition to the overt conflicts--some of which arose from deep ideological differences

and some of which may have represented mere misunderstandings--there were almost certainly latent conflicts which were concealed beneath apparent agreement.

The Need, Desire, and Right To Participate

In trying to describe the discussion on participation which was, perhaps, the largest single theme of the Conference, it will be helpful to draw distinctions among the words, "need," "desire," and "right."* The word "need" will be used in the more-or-less Deweyan objective sense; that is, a need will be considered as a response to an objectively determined lack--a lack not simply "felt" but substantially attached to the objective elements of a problematic situation. Thus, when participants spoke of the "need" to involve teachers in curriculum development, they usually spoke also about the failures that result from not involving them and the benefits which might occur if they were properly involved.

There was considerable disagreement about the role of parents in curriculum development. What represented to some conferees a "basic right" of parents to participate seemed to others to be merely a quite natural "desire" that must be treated with respect and openness in communications but should not be a determining factor in curriculum development or selection. A few conferees, e.g. Lillian Weber, seemed to construe parental participation as a real "need," satisfaction of which brings identifiable and particular rewards to the learning situation. Similarly, the interest of the Federal government was variously seen as

---

*The suggestion that a distinction should be made between "wants" and "needs" was made by Harry Wugalter. The point seems well taken.

a "right" (since education itself may be construed as a "fundamental right"), a "desire" (akin to a wish to meddle benevolently), or a "need" (only government can satisfy certain objective conditions of the problem).

The discussion about the role of teachers in curriculum work was somewhat troubled by implicit differences in defining curriculum. Those who leaned toward a view of curriculum as interactive saw a large role for teachers in curriculum. In Lillian Weber's view, for example, teachers and students work together to build the actual curriculum through their manipulative and interpretive work with natural objects. From this viewpoint, what teachers desperately need is an opportunity to become acquainted with materials and their possibilities. They need teacher resource centers and time to spend in them. A similar view seemed to be held by Edith Schwartz who pointed out that materials were not so important as what teachers do with them.

From another point of view, teachers were seen as inadequately trained for both curriculum creation and curriculum implementation. Lawrence Senesh claimed that teacher-made materials are of "poor quality" and teacher handling of ready-made materials is, also, generally poor. Robert Davis agreed that teachers are poorly trained in subject matters, e.g. mathematics, and Paul Hurd affirmed that teachers "lack conviction" about what to teach and how to teach it. Apparently, teacher institutes are not the answer to the problem--or not, at least, as they are presently conceived. Frank Chase pointed out that teachers sometimes return from such experiences enthusiastic about the new subject matter but at a loss as to how to teach it; they fall back on lecture style.

Jim Gates suggested that we simply do not know enough about learning and effective teaching to conduct institutes that will be successful. Senesh felt that in-service education could not dent the problem, that nothing less than a complete overhaul of pre-service education would bring results.

Some participants referred to Cuban's paper as evidence that teachers represent an actual roadblock to curriculum progress; innovations seem not to make it past the classroom door. Cuban had, of course, suggested reasons for this phenomenon, in particular, the press of conditions under which teachers work, and this "press" was described in detail by Deborah Wolfe who claimed that teachers simply cannot do all we expect of them. Judy Herman also defended teachers, noting that teachers <u>do</u> use resources other than textbooks and would use them more regularly if it were not for constraints of time and money.

David Darland claimed that teachers are not resistant to change but that they <u>do</u> resist <u>imposed</u> change. There seems, then, to be a real <u>need</u> to involve teachers in curriculum development. Several others, e.g. Gates, Taylor, Williams, Randolph, endorsed this view. To elicit the whole-hearted support of teachers in implementation, we must find a way to involve them meaningfully in construction and selection of curriculum.

The role of teacher unions was explored by Joyce Lewis. Tyll van Geel said that even union leadership was divided on the question of whether or not to bring curriculum matters "to the table." Some feared that the autonomy so valued by teachers might actually be

lost in the bargaining process; others felt that bargaining might be the only way to achieve any significant level of participation.

In a hopeful vein, Lloyd Trump and Clarence Blount both claimed that good administrators should be able to manage both facilities and instructional arrangements so that teachers can function optimally. Their remarks suggest that teacher participation in curriculum development might better be thought of as variable--dependent on the talent and enthusiasm of individual teachers and the ability of administrators to capitalize on this competence--than as some fixed right or duty.

From all this, it seems clear that there is a need to involve teachers in curriculum if successful implementation is to be secured; it also seems clear that the mode of involvement envisioned may depend upon a prior definition of "curriculum." Beyond this, "What is clear" is not clear.

The roles of other potential participants were discussed. Teacher educators are not doing an effective job in training teachers to use new curricula, several conferees claimed. Senesh suggested that a reason for this neglect might be that the teacher training institutions had not been involved in the development of the curricula: therefore, they had little interest in seeing the curricula implemented. Again, there seems to be a need for teacher training institutions to participate in curriculum development, but the mode of that participation was not defined.

Subject matter expertise was declared a necessity by many participants. But some conferees noted that subject matter experts should not,

or need not, dominate curriculum projects. Herbert Kliebard described the prevailing model of curriculum development as a "one best way" model; it involves getting together the "best minds" in a particular discipline to create a curriculum. He, as well as others familiar with the history of curriculum development, e.g. Tyler, Gardner, suggested that other ways had been at least partially successful in the past and might be explored again. There was some speculation, for example, about the possible effects of restoring curriculum specialists to roles of considerable influence.

The role of commercial publishers was explored. Barbara Howell maintained that there is, indeed, a "national curriculum" but that it is created quite naturally out of the universally expressed needs and wants of parents and school people. There was an expressed feeling on the part of some curriculum creators, e.g. Davis, that commercial publishers could not handle the task of producing high quality, innovative curricula because they have to "play to the mode" for economic reasons. This contention was challenged by George Archibald but largely confirmed by Roy Millenson who described, among other things, the power of the large "adoption states" in determining what textbooks would be available over a substantial period of time.

This discussion seemed to suggest a role for the professional nonprofit curriculum developer. Would not such an organization or individual be more free to tackle controversial issues and innovative techniques? The question engendered lively controversy. It was pointed out that the value orientation of some innovative projects (MACOS was,

of course, mentioned) ran against the generally accepted value systems of many communities and groups. There is a question, some participants asserted, whether the "money of all the people" should be used to develop programs acceptable only to a few--and downright offensive to some.

Some participants suggested that the development of innovative curricula might be funded by NIE if there were no pressure on schools to adopt them. David Seeley suggested that NIE might properly fund a variety of projects with differing value orientations, that, whereas it should strive for consistency in quality, there is no need for NIE to insist upon consistency in value orientation. Others, e.g. van Geel, suggested that the funding process be "opened up", from public statement of criteria for eligibility and selection to public statement of reasons for the selection of winners.

The role of the Federal government was, of course, considered at length. Most of the relevant discussion appears in Section IV, "Recommendations to NIE" and , so, will not be duplicated here. Suffice it to say, at this point, that a wide range of opinions was advanced as to what the role of the government should be. Fears were expressed that the Federal government might usurp the traditional rights of State and local governments as regulators of education; that professional curriculum developers might use government funding for personal aggrandizement; that Federal involvement might result in the imposition or foisting of curricula upon dissenting groups. On the opposite side, fears were expressed that the needs of various minorities would not be met

except through Federal support; that financially poor areas would not be able to bear the costs of development without federal help; that high quality, innovative programs would "never see the light of day," unless supported by government. Opinions were scattered over the whole range of possibilities on whether government should be involved in needs assessment, initiation of curriculum activity, implementation and/or evaluation of curriculum projects.

Several conferees, e.g. Wolfe, Egge, Brown, commented on the need for NIE and other government agencies to form more effective partnerships with State and local agencies. Wolfe pointed to the primary responsibility of the states, Egge to the growing strength of State and local R & D establishments, Brown and Smith to the increasing power and restiveness of State legislatures and school boards. Several conferees felt that the Federal government, in recognition of the press for participation by all of these groups, might serve useful purposes in gathering and disseminating information, generating and evaluating models of curriculum development, funding research on learning and instruction, and maintaining forums for public discussion.

Some conferees, e.g. Brown, Archibald, Cardenas, noted that the increasing interest of legislators in educational matters is partially a result of a perceived unresponsiveness on the part of school people. Parents and other concerned citizens, they said, were turning more and more to elected officials whom they felt might listen to their complaints and act in their behalf. This unresponsiveness together with recent changes mandated by the judiciary will ensure continued and increasing legislative involvement in education.

Parent participation was a topic that involved the Conference in prolonged debate. There can be no question that parents desire to participate. That their desire to participate has been aroused by a perceived lack is just as obvious. As Judy Almquist put it:

> For decades parents have sent their children to school fairly secure in their feelings that Johnny and Mary were getting a sound, basic education in school and that the constant reinforcement of fundamentals of honesty and integrity were being emphasized. Not any more; and we just want you to know that we are awake,...We want to be included, we think we should be included at the very beginning of any curriculum development program.

How widespread this feeling is, we cannot tell. Chairman Tyler cited some polls which seem to indicate that many parents are reasonably well satisfied with the job being done in schools. Still, there is no question that many of the conferees saw widespread discontent.

Part of this discontent seems to arise from a perceived erosion of local control. In his recommendation to NIE, James Mecklenburger noted, "School boards feel, and I think with some justice, that the Federal Government sometimes by intent, sometimes benignly, is leading the nation away from localism in public schools." Many conferees, while not speaking for local school boards, noted this erosion with some concern; many urged stronger Federal-State-local partnership, support of indigenous development, and increased efforts to hold significant dialogue at all levels. Several also expressed a fear of consensus as an instrument which often delivers matters into the hands of professionals.

But there are other components in the discontent. Many participants were plainly dissatisfied with the job schools are doing in "basic education." Robert Segura spoke of the failure of schools with minority groups in this area. Kris McGough and Stan Salett deplored the substitution of "cultural relativism" and "mental therapy" for academic learning. Others, e.g. Joyce Lewis, Don Egge, suggested that, whatever the actual status of "basic skills," educators must take note of and react appropriately to the perception as it has been put forth.

Further, there seemed to be discontent with the counter-perception of those who endorse "basic education" as archly conservative and restrictive. Ann Kahn urged the conferees to understand that parents who advocate "back to basics" do not wish to deprive their children of critical thinking skills or deep appreciations. They just want, first of all, a good job on the basics. This was a point made by Donald Barr, also, when he commented that parents, generally, do not wish to deprive their children of anything that goes beyond their own knowledge and capabilities.

Another facet of discontent is found in the area of values. Salett claimed that parents are "shocked" by recent curricular developments. Indeed, several participants voiced their distaste for curricula that violated "accepted" values in language, moral standards, and national outlook. George Archibald claimed that legislators, too, are unfavorably disposed toward this orientation in values and that legislative attempts to control curriculum are likely to result. Parental involvement at this level--determination of values to be included in the curriculum--is seen

by some to be a "basic moral right." Donald Barr argued that this basic moral right makes it imperative that curriculum be developed on site. The basic ideological controversy over which should take precedence, the basic rights of parents or the professional responsibility of educators to lead, has already been described in detail.

As a result of all this discussion, many conferees recommended that NIE "do something" to establish significant parental involvement. Although the recommendations were rarely specific, the feeling that "something" should be done was deeply and widely felt.

Interestingly, there was little discussion on any possible need to involve students in curriculum development. Two people who did mention this need, Bob Davis and Lillian Weber, did so out of firm convictions on what curriculum is, and so their contributions on this matter will be discussed in the next section.

There was considerable discussion on the general topic of curriculum development and needs assessment as political processes. There were some who saw curriculum development as inevitably and thoroughly political (van Geel, Resnick, Archibald, Blount) and others who saw nonpolitical processes within the essentially political major process (Broudy, Green). There were suggestions as to how the process might be "depoliticized" and descriptions of efforts in that direction. A hopeful and constructive note was sounded in this connection by Bill Boyd. He noted that curriculum projects are frequently better when they have emerged from a frankly political process. Decker Walker seconded this and suggested that we might do better to ask: What kind of politics shall we use? than to ask: How

can we exclude politics from the process? And that is perhaps, as clear and true a note as we shall find on which to end this theme.

Problems of Curriculum

The material to be discussed here involves, primarily, theoretical and practical problems of great importance to professionals in the field.

The first, quite naturally, concerns the definition of "curriculum." While many definitions have no doubt been offered in response to NIE's Discussion Guide query, two main views seemed to stand out at the conference. Many participants, in referring to "curriculum," seemed to have in mind a "preactive" view, one which construes curriculum as a body of materials prepared in advance and intended for instruction. Certainly, this view guided much of the discussion. Others seemed to hold rather consistently to an "interactive" view,* one which sees curriculum as an outcome of interactions among teachers, students, and materials. A few participants were explicit in taking even broader views. (See Chase's definition in the individual sets of recommendations, Appendix C.) And some seemed to see the "preactive-interactive" distinctions as one of stages in development rather than as one of fundamentally different views of curriculum.

A thorough-going advocate of the interactive view, e.g. Lillian Weber, insists that curriculum must be developed with students. Materials, then, should be available in great variety and they should be rich in possibilities. From this point of view, teachers need time and

---

*The "preactive-interactive" distinction is due to Philip W. Jackson, "The Way Teaching Is," in The Way Teaching Is (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1966), pp. 7-27.

expert, informal guidance in doing the following: gaining familiarity with materials, discovering uses for them, establishing continuities across instructional and social domains, creating their own materials for the purposes they have established.

In a modified interactive view, Bob Davis claimed that new curricula must be developed with students. This process requires a curriculum developer who is both expert in the subject matter and proficient in teaching students of the given age group. The outcome should be a high quality program that is pedagogically sound. Exactly what this implies for teacher training, beyond rigorous training in subject matter, is not clear. Whether the original developer's ingenuity as a teacher might be required of all teachers using the materials is a question of some concern.

When discussion centered on the preactive phase of curriculum, there were (as has already been noted) differences of opinion on whether government should engage in the direct funding of curriculum projects. Reasons advanced in advocacy of such funding included the following:

(1) New curricula are risky economically. They are, in their initial phases, experimental by their very nature. Hence commercial developers cannot undertake to produce them.

(2) Original thinking in the curriculum area is rare. Capable innovators must be identified and supported, lest the whole field slip into a dismal sameness.

(3) Curriculum development has a research function. Many significant problems in teaching, learning, group dynamics, and development itself arise in the process of development and can be defined for further research.

(4) Curriculum development has a practical learning function. We learn from our attempts at curriculum creation--whether or not the particular product is an economic or pedagogical success. To become proficient at curriculum development, we must engage in it.

How to involve teachers in curriculum development where emphasis is on prepared materials and packaged programs was a major subject of debate. If development occurs at a national level, at most a few teachers can be involved in programs which must be implemented by many teachers. If development occurs at the local level, there is a possibility that sufficient subject matter expertise will not be available and the resulting curricula may be conceptually poor.

A related problem involves the role of knowledge in the curriculum. As Harry Broudy pointed out, whether or not to include knowledge (here construed as something established prior to instruction) in the curriculum is a political question. But there are questions central to the "nitty-gritty" problems of curriculum. If knowledge is to be included in the curriculum, and if that knowledge is largely determined and encoded within the disciplines, is it not necessary that someone translate it into a suitable system for pedagogy at various levels? Again, there is the problem of enormous lag if we are to wait for commercial producers to catch up with the frontiers of knowledge.

There is another "knowledge" problem for curriculum theorists and developers. Ralph Tyler noted that kids rarely remember what is taught in school unless the material turns out to be useful outside of school.

In keeping with this observation, Broudy suggested that we need to know more about the uses of knowledge in everyday life--not only about useful skills but also something about the kinds of information people use in making interpretations and judgments and the sorts of processes by which they make them.

The problem of what might be termed "curriculum implementation lag" was discussed at length. What accounts for the lack of change, discussed by Cuban, in actual classroom activity? Why is change confined largely to the theoretical level? Some endorsed Cuban's view that an important factor blocking change in the classroom is the press of conditions under which teachers work. Others suggested that the lack results from inadequate teacher preparation, failure of administrators to provide proper support, or a pervasive rejection of substantial change in the larger community.

Still others, of course, rejected the basic Cuban contention. They felt that large, and sometimes undesirable, changes had occurred in classrooms and that these changes demanded examination and, perhaps, reversal.

There seem, then, to be at least two problems for curriculum researchers in this area: identification of levels at which changes might take place and the probable characteristics of change at each level; empirical studies to determine just what changes have actually occurred at each level--including any which may have gone unanticipated by the conceptual studies.

The enormous emphasis of the Conference on political/participation problems raised some practical problems for curriculum workers. If many groups are to be involved at some level of curriculum development and if local initiative is to be encouraged, how are all these activities to be coordinated? How can we maintain a binding and unifying core of curriculum amidst proliferating diversity? There was considerable discussion, here, on the role government might play in gathering and disseminating information, supporting model construction and evaluation, providing expert consultants, and promoting public forums for the exchange of information and the expression of viewpoints.

Other topics in curriculum theory/practice were suggested but, perhaps because of the diversity in interests and competencies of the conferees, they were not discussed in any depth. Herb Kliebard suggested, for example, that curriculum as a whole needs attention and the curricula in individual subject areas need to be related to this integral curriculum. A suggestion similar to this was made, also, by David Williams. Several participants, e.g. Shaver, Trump, suggested that consideration be given to problems of curriculum evaluation and "product validation." There were suggestions that studies be made of current needs and the range of curricula available to meet them and some nonspecific suggestions that more conceptual research in the area of curriculum should be conducted.

Before turning to "A Chronological Account of the Conference," readers should be aware that another theme or trend seems to emerge in the proceedings: There seems to be a repeated preference for research over development or for research related to development over

development itself. This matter will be discussed in Section IV, "Recommendations." Readers should, however, decide for themselves whether this trend is discernible. Certainly, there were those who opposed it.

III. A CHRONOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CONFERENCE

Introductory Session

Harold Hodgkinson, Director of NIE, delivered NIE's official welcome to the participants. In his brief opening talk, he underscored the need to look at curriculum broadly, to look, in particular, at outcomes of curriculum which were unplanned and unforeseen. The tone was set, then, for broad discussion.

Jon Schaffarzick, Chairman of NIE's Curriculum Development Task Force, then initiated the work of the conference. He reminded participants of the purposes of the conference, outlined and explained the rationale for the conference format, described the program of the Curriculum Development Task Force and the influence of the Roald Campbell consulting committee on its planning, and introduced several observer-participants (NIE staffers, a member of NCER, consultants on The Report). He described, also, the role of NCER in educational policy matters and the sequence of events which had preceded the conference and which would follow it.

Finally, Schaffarzick introduced Ralph Tyler, Chairman of the conference, who spoke briefly before starting the first discussion. He reminded the participants, again, that a prime purpose of the conference would be to provide "illumination and clarification" of the issues--not to persuade each other toward specific viewpoints. He then invited the participants who had been designated to start the discussion to take their places at the central table.*

---

*See Appendix B for a list of designated central table participants.

Wednesday Morning: Session 2

Discussion Question: What social, political, and legal forces influence the curriculum and curriculum activities?

It was at this session that most of the discussion about curriculum change (or lack of it) and about uniformity/diversity in curriculum took place.

Chairman Tyler opened the discussion by describing an apparent anomaly. How is it, he asked, that although we recognize enormous diversity in our society and might expect to find thousands of curricula in our schools, children are able to move rather easily from state to state, finding--apparently--a relatively uniform curriculum?

John Wirt then pointed out that there seemed to be a great change over time in the subjects taught at the elementary school level. Chairman Tyler countered this by noting that 60% of the elementary curriculum still concentrates on the 3R's.

Lawrence Senesh next sharpened Tyler's initial question by contrasting a "grass roots ideal" of curriculum development with the reality of uniformity. He suggested that a "copy" phenomenon was at work, that there was little local initiative in fact operating, and that, indeed, curriculum workers tended either to copy the work of major publishers and projects or, simply, to adopt these curricula with no attempt at adapting them.

George Archibald picked up Senesh's comment on the influence of the major projects and described how this influence led to controversies that were aired at Congressional meetings, e.g. the MACOS controversy.

He described the national projects as "having enormous impact." At this point, Chairman Tyler asked Archibald to explain what he meant by "impact" and Archibald said that he was referring to the influence on the direction of professional education and practice--on the "entire platter of materials" made available. He stated that the "copy" phenomenon mentioned by Senesh was operating at a point approaching plagiarism, that indeed there was at least one instance of reported plagiarism that had gone undetected even though the project had been funded by the government.

Peggy Ott suggested that, although curriculum guides are copied and passed about by workers in the field, these guides are almost never used--that commercial texts still form the backbone of curriculum materials in the classroom. Who influences them, she asked. Kris McGough endorsed this observation and expressed surprise and dismay at the staleness, uniformity, and lack of innovation she has seen in instructional materials.

Barbara Howell then tried to answer Ott's question about publishers. She suggested that there "is in fact a national curriculum," that publishers hear again and again the same expressed needs from parents and school people, and hence the resulting published materials are very much the same.

Edith Schwartz changed the direction of the discussion by suggesting that materials are not all that critical, that what the teacher <u>does</u> with the materials is "the key" to the quality of instruction and learning in the classroom.

John Valentine returned to the discussion of uniformity/diversity by noting that both are in evidence. He cited the Advanced Placement program of the C.E.E.B. as an example of diversity operating in the midst of general uniformity.

Bill Boyd began an effort which persisted sporadically through the rest of the session. He suggested a reason for the existing uniformity: a desire to avoid controversy (in order to sell, retain jobs, etc.).

Elliot Eisner then refined Schwartz's earlier comment on the importance of the teacher's role by noting that whether we observe uniformity or diversity depends upon the level of analysis from which we are working. From this viewpoint, it might be suggested that, while there is uniformity in materials, there is diversity in, e.g., instructional arrangements.

Dave Seeley next continued Boyd's effort to find reasons for uniformity. He mentioned a significant justification for a uniform core of material, namely common needs in a sophisticated society. Carl Dolce agreed that the requirements of a national society tend to promote uniformity but expressed some distress at a "growing sameness." He noted, however, that there are increasing numbers of minority teachers and this development might be expected to press for diversity.

At this point, Gary Sykes (speaking for Larry Cuban who was not present on Wednesday) entered another reason for uniformity: the press of conditions under which teachers work, e.g. class size, drafted population. Seeley then emphasized the need for both uniformity and

diversity but counseled against what he described as a "muddled middle"--a sort of mindless blending of the two.

Jim Shaver next suggested that publishers played a large role in promoting uniformity. He noted that even the process of text choice is uniform, i.e. "every four years you adopt another textbook." Bill Moore questioned the feasibility of publishers' engaging in small projects that might promote local diversity. Tyler pointed out that our annual expenditure for materials is decreasing in the wake of increased expenditures for salaries. This tendency adds to the problems of publishers in trying to make ends meet.

George Archibald disagreed, averring that publishers have expressed a willingness to undertake small projects. He contended that special interest groups promoted nonprofit groups as curriculum developers because they were said to be more "aloof" and unafraid to tackle "controversial questions." When these programs are examined, he continued, their tendency to "question all our values" is revealed. He gave as an example of this value orientation a quote (paraphrased) from the Washington Post attributed to Peter Dow (MACOS): "We are trying to get away from the idea that there are eternal truths that should be passed on from one generation to another." This orientation, Archibald contended, turns legislators off.

Peter Dow acknowledged the accuracy of the paraphrase. He went on to enter another reason for uniformity--the "poverty of originial thinking" in the curriculum area--and recommended that NIE make an effort to identify innovators. He reminded participants that teachers

take "immense risk" when they attempt innovation in the classroom, that any innovation in education is risky because it is practiced on "our most precious commodity"--our children.

Robert Segura drew attention to the massive failure of the schools with respect to minority groups. He felt that risk taking might have to be rewarded if we are to find a way of meeting our expressed commitments to diversity in our communities. Tyll van Geel pointed out that the worry about risk is warranted, because education, as a public institution, is a part of government, and we in this country are properly wary of government, since it is authoritative and powerful. Decker Walker agreed and added that local control exercises direct fury on teachers and principals who stray from accepted procedures, further decreasing the likelihood of risk taking.

Kris McGough next spoke about the "conformity of innovation," noting that she had become "controversial" because she had asked for chronological history to be included in the curriculum as an alternative to conceptual history. She suggested that we need to identify common needs and then provide diversity beyond these. She insisted that federal projects do have an impact--a "scary" impact.

Lawrence Senesh suggested that materials can provide diversity, but teachers are overly dependent on textbooks. He pointed out, also, that teacher education institutions will not cooperate in the training of teachers in new materials because the materials have been developed outside the training institutions. He added that community participation is frequently at the lip-service level, because laymen are not given the help they need to participate effectively.

Stan Salett questioned the notion that parents are "threatening" to teachers and other professionals. On the contrary, he said, parents feel they have little or no impact on the schools, that schools are neither open nor responsive to them.

At this point, Tom Green summarized the contradictory views that had so far been heard: Projects have had no impact; they have had enormous impact. The public can do the job; the public can't do the job. Teachers are defenseless; no, parents are defenseless; no, innovators are defenseless. It seems that government policy must be very modest, recognizing these conflicts. Except for certain areas where development costs are prohibitive, e.g., bilingual ed., government should, perhaps, start by doing nothing and then let people who want to do something bear the burden of proving its worth.

Chairman Tyler then suggested that perhaps we should look at curriculum from the point of view of the child. He noted that what is learned in school is rarely retained unless it proves useful and is thus reinforced outside of school.

Ron Brandt pointed out that we need to decide where curriculum decisions should be made, because imposition at the local level is just as much imposition as that which occurs at another level. We must involve parents in significant participation and options.

Joyce Lewis expressed acceptance of uniformity in school curriculum, noting that much significant learning takes place outside of school.

Deborah Wolfe saw a need for appropriate participation at every level, claiming that states must accept responsibility for basic

curriculum but that the Federal government has to be involved in the special programs which serve the interest of minorities who would otherwise be neglected and in innovative projects which might otherwise never see the light of day.

The "overly fat" curriculum was next explored by Robert Segura. He decried the human "clutter" in classrooms: tutors, aides, assessors, parents. This clutter interferes with learning, he felt.

Judy Herman defended teachers against an earlier charge that they failed to use resources other than texts. She observed that many teachers do use museums, field trips, community resources, but frequently there is not sufficient money for full use of these resources and for grass roots curriculum development.

Dave Seeley next shared an insight he gained from "sitting up all night reading papers." He suggested that we function unconsciously with a factory model of education, a picture of education as a system that has plans, production schemes, products, quality control, etc. He felt that NIE policy should be developed with a conscious avoidance of this model.

Ron Smith warned of both the frustration and power of legislators in educational matters. He predicted that legislatures would take an increasingly strong hand in regulating educational efforts, since it is felt that schools have been unresponsive to questions raised by legislators. Archibald asked whether these comments were made "pejoratively"; that is, was Smith suggesting that state legislatures do not have an appropriate role in this area? Smith answered this in

the negative; his purpose, he said, was "to get your attention." Too often, he counseled, we tend to overlook the interest of a frustrated group until it shows its frustration through active use of its powers. Archibald reiterated his earlier claim that parents, too, are annoyed and frustrated by many trends in professional education and noted that people are turning to legislators because legislators, as elected representatives, listen to the complaints of parents.

Donald Barr described the morning as an exercise in show-and-tell. He felt that many groups were wallowing in self-pity. Why, after all, reward risk-taking, he asked, when children are at risk? Why protect innovators from criticism? It's part of the game! We should care more about the rights of parents. Basic moral and civic rights must be protected. He further suggested that the "worship of innovation" should be rejected.

Chairman Tyler concluded by noting that the subject had certainly not been exhausted but that the schedule required attendance at lunch, and the meeting was adjourned.

Wednesday Afternoon: Session 1

Discussion Question: What are the alternative ways of developing curricula?

Robert Davis opened this session with several points:

1) Curriculum needs a home. As an example, one might ask who determines the definition of, say, logarithms. Although competing preferred definitions may exist in mathematical circles, some one or some group must decide for pedagogical purposes. 2) Concepts should be introduced

gradually. 3) Curriculum should be developed with kids. Testing and trying out (piloting) are not sufficient. 4) Teachers are properly thought of as professionals, but they are poorly trained for subjects like mathematics. 5) Teacher training institutions are weak; no school takes the responsibility for teaching mathematics to teachers. 6) Publishers can't handle development of new curricula because they must play to the mode.

These points, were not immediately built upon, but a vital and interesting debate arose. Donald Barr introduced his notion of "two attitudes" toward curriculum development. The ensuing exchange between Barr and Elliot Eisner has been recorded in the thematic section, "The Role of the School in a Pluralistic and Changing Society." It is perhaps sufficient at this point to remind the reader that the exchange vividly pointed up important differences in fundamental educational ideology.

Following the Barr-Eisner exchange, Lillian Weber spoke in favor of the "generic" curriculum, a curriculum based on natural language, familiar objects in the environment, and actual manipulation of that language and those objects. There were moments of well received humor--for example, when Weber noted that her advocacy of parent involvement might make it sound as though she "agreed with Dr. Barr. And I never have so far!" (The point illustrated is important for the reader. One cannot easily identify in these proceedings "factions" or even, "representatives," for participants moved often and easily from one loose alliance to another based on their support of particular points.

The reasons for support frequently varied significantly.) Weber agreed with Davis that curriculum must be generated in a face-to-face setting, but she would include students, teachers, and parents in confrontation with natural materials.

Larry Senesh spoke next. He suggested that "grantsmanship" had created a "horribly lopsided" authorship of curriculum materials. Tyler interrupted to agree that the people who deserve it "don't always get the money," to which Senesh assented by joking, "I don't want to complain." The talk continued on a more serious vein. Senesh found a multiplicity of curriculum authors properly working in interaction. Grantsmanship destroyed the sensitive balance in this interaction. There is a need to restore parents to a bona fide partnership in educational matters. Yet we must keep in mind, Senesh implored, that the purpose of education is subversion. Parents can be involved even so if someone takes the trouble to communicate with them.

Decker Walker tried, next, to interpret the Kanawha County incident in light of the analytic framework outlined in his paper. He suggested that curriculum development may properly be conceived as three endeavors: 1) development of generic materials, materials to be made available for use anywhere ("generic" is used somewhat differently here from Weber's sense), 2) development and/or selection of materials at a particular school, 3) the making of broad policy decisions about what shall be taught. Walker went on to interpret the Kanawha incident as a failure in category two, that is, as a failure of site-specific curriculum development which by its very

nature demands the participation of those directly affected by decisions in the area. An assumption of unanimity was made where no such unanimity existed.

Barr suggested that, whereas Walker contended that some parents had been involved in the Kanawha curriculum decisions, parents had not in fact been consulted at all. He went on to insist that there is arrogance in an attitude that would impose curricula on dissenting parents; it involves an abuse of parental rights. Curriculum must evolve on site.

Peter Dow characterized views of parental participation in curriculum as "romantic." He avowed that he shared some of this "romanticism," but that we must recognize that--as Senesh claimed--education is, in a large sense, subversive. He deplored the lack of a coherent social policy to guide a truly subversive effort in education--a concerted attempt to change values, an attempt which Dow saw as "essential" to education.

Tyler pointed out that the conferees had not yet grappled with the question of alternative methods of developing curricula, perhaps because prior questions had not been answered satisfactorily. The questions which kept arising, he noted, had to do with who should make what decisions in curriculum.

Marjorie Gardner undertook to describe two modes of government involvement in curriculum, suggesting that the funding of "national projects" is certainly not the only mode of government participation. She cited aid for both generic development, e.g., the major projects,

and site-specific development through the use of curriculum specialists who acted as advisors to local districts. She questioned what might have resulted if this second mode had not been discontinued.

Lloyd Trump advanced the notion that we might opt for a required curriculum based on universal needs and a supplementary curriculum comprising topics of local interest to be chosen locally rather than trying to develop a curriculum which is "good for everybody." The question then becomes: Who will develop all this? It seems we must encourage the provision of "cultural smorgasbords" by local groups, and the national government might be involved in advising groups how to develop these curricular alternatives.

The attention of the group was next drawn to political and economic forces on curriculum. Ray Hannapel emphasized the role of allocation of monies on curriculum development. Materials are increasingly expensive, and monies are increasingly being diverted from materials. He endorsed the idea that we must plan for diversity in curricula in order to accommodate the pluralism in our society.

Herbert Kliebard returned to the central question, outlining the dangers in the prevailing model, which he described as the "one best way" model (getting the "best minds" together to create the "one best" curriculum): first, a bad curriculum might be adopted on a grand scale; second, a good curriculum might not achieve sufficient acceptance to warrant the expenditure on development. He recommended seeking alternatives, e.g., funding small groups for special purposes.

Chairman Tyler reminded the group that the mode described by Kliebard as the prevailing model is relatively new. He described commissions which, in the past, recommended what should be taught without actually producing curricula and outlined several other modes which had, in the past, been used with some degree of effectiveness.

Stan Salett felt there was a need to relate strategies of curriculum development to parental rights. He cited Larry Cuban's paper as evidence that much of the money that has been spent on curriculum development has been spent on something that never had a real effect.

Jose Cardenas suggested that there are two ways, basically, in which change occurs in schools: internal and external. There are, he noted, defects in each. When schools are motivated internally toward change, the professionals involved sometimes fail to maintain communication with other concerned parties in the community. He deplored the evident isolation of the school in the community. External motivation may occur as a result of this failure to communicate and may take the form of pressures brought by special interest groups, legislation, or litigation.

Although the conferees were still "going strong," Chairman Tyler called a scheduled break at this point.

Wednesday Afternoon: Session 2

Discussion Question: What are and have been the roles of the Federal government in curriculum development?

Marjorie Gardner opened the discussion by outlining the past involvements of national agencies, e.g., NSF, OE, in curriculum matters. (The reader may refer to her paper, "A Brief History of Federal Involvement in Curriculum Development," for details.) She noted a shift in policy from an earlier hands-off orientation to one of concern with implementation.

Herbert Kliebard next discussed some of the outstanding curricula which had been developed locally rather than federally. (Refer to Kliebard's paper, "Systematic Curriculum Development, 1890-1959: An Interpretive Survey.") He mentioned, for example, the Winnetka and Dalton Plans.

George Archibald warned that Congress will become involved in judging the worth of curriculum projects--both content and process--because federal tax monies are involved. He referred, as did Gardner, to an interesting and useful Library of Congress Report entitled "The National Science Foundation and Pre-College Science Education, 1950-1975," available through the House Science and Technology Committee. He referred also to the Moudy Report which looked at MACOS and a GAO report, "NSF Supported Science Education Materials: Problems of Evaluation, Distribution, and Monitoring." He claimed that a few groups and people are "in the business" of getting federal monies, and that most NSF money has gone to a relatively few organizations.

Frank Chase found some consistency in the Federal role in curriculum development, namely that of "correcting imbalances" in or through curriculum. The NSF tried to correct an imbalance in math/

science education, for example. Other consistent roles of government have been to promote public debate, to produce or encourage designs or models to increase achievement, to promote evaluation.

Deborah Wolfe listed several roles of the Federal government. She saw the government as promoter of minority rights, special science and language projects, and common education; as stimulator of innovative projects; and as primary educator in the trusts and territories. She recommended that the Federal government involve the states and counties in closer partnership.

In a similar vein, Jesse Coles pointed out that considerable progress had been made in equalizing education nationally through government intervention. He made a plea for continued support to poor areas. He also feared that the position advocated by Archibald against funding of generic development might handicap those school systems which could not possibly engage in their own. Archibald then tried to clarify his position. He reemphasized that continued government involvement in generic development would inevitably bring increasing Congressional surveillance because there would be "reasonable differences" among people surveying these programs.

Bob Davis expressed surprise that there had been so little defense of the NSF programs. He felt that NSF might better be criticized for the lack of impact resulting from its efforts. The problems still exist. Someone must take responsibility for adequate preparation of teachers in mathematics and science and for curriculum development in these areas.

Paul Hurd commented that involvement in curriculum development on the part of government dated back to 1798. He pointed out that many curriculum choices were actually made available to schools through Federal grants: seven forms of BSCS and a total of ninety other projects in biology. He drew attention to a "shift" in orientation in curriculum matters as well as in science itself--a shift toward value-loaded problems at every level. Among the lessons we learned from the NSF projects are these two: We need subject matter expertise in curriculum development; we should not expect success from every project--rather, we learn from each experience.

Donald Barr added a cautionary word to the general defense of NSF. He agreed that NSF had not been coercive in its initial stages of operation, but a shift occurred. Some danger, he suggested, is involved in combining funding for initiation and implementation. Such a combination, while tempting, would put NSF in the position of "selling" its products. This shift in attitude should, therefore, be avoided.

Dave Seeley mentioned another role of government--quite different from its role in curriculum development. He listed "White House Conferences" as part of a "hortatory" or encouraging role of government. He went on to suggest that the government should exert leadership with willingness to communicate what it is doing. It should, in other words, try to separate its support from coercion through broad discussion and responsible leadership.

Todd Endo drew attention to what he felt were two sorts of failures in funding. Failures of the first type, for example investments in bilingual education,

have had little impact on student outcomes, although they have been effective in redistributing power and influence. Failures of the second type, as in career education, have resulted from investments that are too diffuse.

Clarence Blount suggested that there is a contradiction in wanting federal money and no federal control. In reality, government enforces appropriate social change by controlling the conditions under which it will give monies; it helps states to look after the welfare of all their citizens; it provides help for private colleges in areas of its own important self-interest.

Gordon Brown felt that the current role of government in education represented a continuation of past practices and a tenuous exploration of future possibilities. He suggested that, in all likelihood, Congress would play a large role in determining NIE's policy stance.

Marjorie Gardner concluded the session by reminding the group that Congress has long been friendly to curriculum development and teacher training, and we should not forget that its role has been largely supportive to education over the years.

This comment was endorsed by Chairman Tyler with particular examples, and he then adjourned the meeting.

Wednesday Afternoon: Summary Session

On Wednesday and Thursday afternoons of the conference, time was provided for those participants who would not be returning to state their recommendations to NIE.

On Wednesday afternoon, Barbara Howell was the first speaker. She began by outlining ways in which educational publishers influence

the whole educational enterprise. She reiterated that there is a national curriculum and that publishers provide what teachers, administrators, and parents have indicated they want. The risk involved, of course, is that people will change their minds! Publishers implement what people say they want.

Her recommendations were these:

(1) NIE should provide help in involving and informing parents in curriculum matters.

(2) NIE should provide help for curriculum directors at the local level.

(3) NIE should provide help for significant development of substantial curricula in special education. She suggested that "mainstreaming" as it is conceived today is a "terrifying" notion and that education would have to come to grips with the real problems of the physically and mentally handicapped.

In discussion, Lawrence Senesh and Todd Endo were largely supportive. Endo suggested that NIE's help to special education ought to be directed toward the programs already mandated by law.

In answer to a question about how NIE might help specifically with the involvement of parents, Howell suggested that NIE sponsor the writing of a booklet for parents on how to evaluate their child's school program and materials.

Jim Shaver counseled that we need to look at the assumptions underlying programs and not just at the potential value of the area

in which funds are sought. Too often, he felt, ill-conceived programs are funded just because they fall into the area of Special Education. He commented that NIE really doesn't have enough money to do much of anything in curriculum. Ray Hannapel confirmed that total national expenditure for curriculum development probably has totaled only about 5 million/year over the past few years.

Dave Seeley presented his recommendations next:

(1) NIE should be agressive in promoting good programs; it need not be consistent in the value orientations it supports through these programs.

(2) NIE should promote parent involvement.

(3) NIE should seek and support innovations; it should back a variety of quality programs, even conflicting ones.

(4) NIE need not promote utility; it should discard the factory model in its policy planning.

There followed a general discussion about the recommendations made by Seeley and Howell. Deborah Wolfe defended teachers against an implicit charge of ignorance; she outlined the difficulties under which teachers work and the lack of funds for materials other than texts. Larry Senesh also defended the American teacher's creativity but insisted that improved teacher training is necessary. Lillian Weber defended teachers strongly; she suggested that administrators are frequently responsible for the materials teachers use. She suggested that NIE support teacher resource centers.

The session was forced to a conclusion by Chairman Tyler who reminded the group of a scheduled reception.

Thursday Morning: Session 1

Discussion Question: What are American children learning now? Where are they learning it?

Chairman Tyler set the tone by noting that the total educational system is much larger than the system for formal schooling, that children learn much of what they learn outside of school.

Kris McGough prefaced her remarks by charging that the public was vastly under-represented at the conference. She went on to say that many parents are unhappy with what their children are learning in today's schools. They are learning moral and cultural relativism, she claimed, but no grammar. They are exposed to personality profiles and psycho-social programs but no academic learning. She recommended that NIE fund research on learning.

The next speaker, Paul Hurd, spoke about changes in society--particularly, in the home--which have influenced what children are learning. He said it is extremely difficult to determine what children are learning outside school because of the fragmentation in home life and a resulting lack of communication.

Larry Senesh agreed that the learning environment outside of schools is rich and complex and needs to be looked at. He felt that it is especially important that a bridge be built between school and community in the world of work--that work not be presented as "suffering."

Jim Shaver spoke about some of the shortcomings in contemporary education: not much formal training in basic skills including those

for citizenship, not very sound informal training for citizenship, not much help for parents who want to tutor their own children, not much help with moral instruction. He suggested that many parents do see schools as aloof and autocratic. He further charged that the schools are not very democratic institutions. Chairman Tyler took exception to this comment, pointing out that Project Talent revealed a general feeling on the part of graduates that they had learned in school quite a bit about social relations and democratic procedures if little about other important matters. Shaver replied that kids do learn these things in school but informally, that the school is socially democratic but not politically democratic. He concluded by endorsing McGough's recommendation for research on learning.

Tyll van Geel returned to Hurd's comments. Because of the trend to working couples, he suggested, there will be an increasing need for high quality pre-school education and for better education for those who will work in this area.

Migdalia Romero de Ortiz suggested that several educational theories need reexamination, among them "deprivation theory" and the theory underlying ESL. Instead of "lamenting" changes in family and society, she said, we ought to be studying these changes and using them to build an educational system soundly oriented to reality. There needs to be a stronger coordination between home and school; not only must what is learned in school be reinforced at home but, perhaps more importantly, what is learned at home and needed at home must be reinforced in school.

Harry Broudy next attempted to identify and classify some of the things children learn outside of school. He listed as gathered outside of school: factual information in great variety, standards of taste, standards of success. He mentioned the popular arts as a rich source of student learning. One possible role for the school in handling this outside learning is to aid students in organizing and critiquing the standards and information they acquire.

Gordon Brown put forward a list of beliefs students seem to be acquiring in schools: that schooling is of questionable worth, that school is not a part of the real world, that loss of services is a powerful motivation for action, that schools are political footballs... Again, Chairman Tyler demurred, citing polls which seem to show that, although adults are critical about some aspects of education, they still feel schools are vital and that schooling is a means to upward mobility. Brown held his ground, insisting that the dissatisfaction is with <u>how things are now</u> in schools--not with the <u>idea</u> of schooling.

Robert Segura reminded participants of his previous reference to an "overly fat" curriculum: Everything goes in, nothing comes out! He suggested that schools need to do a better job with basic skills, particularly with minority students. He cited a general neglect of <u>dialogue</u>. It would seem, he said, that the school might recognize the lack of general conversation induced by television and compensate for it by providing opportunities for meaningful dialogue in the school setting.

Stan Salett began by expressing his feeling that the conference was not really a conference but more nearly a hearing, that there was not sufficient opportunity for dialogue, that the sought-after "illumination" was not being achieved. Both Chairman Tyler and Jon Schaffarzick attempted to clarify the rationale of the conference. Salett then turned to the substance of his comments. He felt that parents are "stunned" by many recent curriculum developments, e.g., the cultural relativism, the psycho-clinical emphasis; that parents are disappointed by the school's performance in contributing to upward mobility. Here Tyler, again, attempted to clarify points involving the Jencks' report, but the controversy remained unresolved until Harry Broudy pinpointed the difficulty: Whatever the proper interpretation of studies may be, the news is that it doesn't pay to go to school. Right, said Salett, but parents still believe that it should pay to go to school. Parents are concerned about an apparent falling off in basic skills, about poor facilities for preschool care, about the (apparently increasing) practice of manning reading and math centers with volunteers rather than professional teachers. He concluded by saying that it is predictable that parents' alienation would affect the learning of children, and he cited as an indication of parental alienation the "tragedy of PTA"--a steadily dropping membership.

Carl Dolce suggested some attitudes students are acquiring in schools: that the world is made of impressions and images not requiring critical analysis; that actions have no consequences; that even difficult and complex things are accomplished easily. He recommended

that we recognize that school time is limited and that we must, therefore, set priorities. Otherwise, we risk the possibility that schools will do nothing well. He counseled against the temptation to reorganize the entire environment; this course, he warned, is filled with frightening political implications.

Ann Kahn clarified some issues raised by other speakers. She claimed that the loss in PTA membership was not so serious, that indeed the organization was leaner but more active. She cautioned that the "back to basics" movement should not be construed as a move to deprive or so to restrict curriculum that important enriching topics should be left out. Parents still want thinking skills and appreciations, but they especially want a competent job in the area of basics.

Chairman Tyler summarized by emphasizing Dolce's comments on the need for priorities and the impossibility of the school's taking on every task suggested for it. He then declared a break.

Thursday Morning: Session 2

Discussion Question: What kinds of educational improvements are perceived as needed now?

Ron Brandt opened the session with a "laundry list" of areas needing improvement: written composition, ESL, life skills, social studies programs which now tend to neglect history and geography. He spoke highly of MACOS and recommended that such high quality programs be continued but that options be developed for parents and children who object to those programs.

Lloyd Trump expressed the feeling that consensus is unnecessary. It is possible to have "Schools for Everyone", in which there are carefully planned, monitored options.

John Wirt described several curriculum development models and stated that fundamental changes in curriculum modeling suggest curriculum development itself as a platform for research.

Frank Chase spoke about four kinds of changes in curriculum: those involved in cultural pluralism, the notion that schooling is only one part of learning, the move to "hands on learning", and the change from a restrictive curriculum to a facilitative curriculum. He concentrated on the last. A facilitative curriculum, he emphasized, aids students in using their abilities and skills to master further learning. He recommended that further research be conducted on instructional analysis and improvement.

Bill Boyd reminded the conferees of a recurring theme. He saw professionals in education as oriented toward change and parents, frequently, as perceiving the need to conserve. He recommended an orientation of respect for parents and the creation of genuine options.

Don Egge attempted to identify several areas needing improvement and tried to link them to current trends in professional education. The proliferation of State and local R & D's, for example, would seem to imply a need for support in the form of systematic transmission of information. In this connection, he also saw a need to identify systems which are less expensive, which might permit more effective local

development. Support is needed, also, in providing: information about the technology of instruction, help to teachers with analysis of curriculum, identification of proper roles of participants in education, and identification of competencies. He emphasized the need for educators to accept the need to improve basic skills.

Lillian Weber cited relations between teachers and parents as an area needing improvment. She saw a need for educators to seek the consent of parents for proposed improvements, to receive and examine their proferred criticisms. She identified a second need for improvement in the area of helping teachers to make connections and provide continuities in a complex educational environment which extends well beyond the classroom walls.

Onalee McGraw mentioned several moves which might constitute significant improvement: a move away from mental health orientations, cultural relativism, and pervasive invasions of privacy toward teaching the basics and developing the intellect; a move away from process back to content. She cited a program in moral education, The Ethical Quest, which she felt distorted the purpose and meaning of moral education.

Joyce Lewis noted that, after all, we must react to perceptions; this means that we must respond to the request to return to basics. She recommended that the Federal government stay out and let State governments use their monies to develop programs suitable for their own people. She raised a question about how great a role was being played by volunteers in schools. How much actual teaching are they doing? How are they screened? evaluated?

The next few speakers listed their recommendations for improvements in a straightforward way which involved little dialogue:

Bill Moore : We need practical experiences to reinforce school learning, we need better needs assessment.

Peggy Ott : We need better planning for all phases of education; we should examine futurist writing for help.

Nelle Taylor : Parents need help in participating effectively in curriculum; they need information about why the schools do what they do. Teachers should be involved more closely in curriculum development and other educational enterprises. The Federal government might properly be involved in the improvement of TV programming.

John Maxwell : Teachers of English need information about the conditions under which students can learn spoken and written English. How much time should certain efforts take? In what form should those efforts be cast?

Roy Millenson: We need information about how to achieve certain goals we seem to be agreed upon: bilingual education, optimal education for the handicapped, equalization of opportunity, integration. We need information on how to spend less more effectively; how to handle an anti-teacher trend; how to handle vandalism and hooliganism. We

need to give help and guidance to textbook committees so that they may function more objectively and effectively.

Donald Barr : We need a reduction in curriculum clutter and a refinement of instructional techniques--we should usher in penmanship, rhetoric, grammar, chronological history and homework; we should usher out invasions of the psyche, gimmicks, learning packets, workbooks, unearned electivity, ineffective individualization, most of career education.

Kris McGough : We need to improve continuity in the curriculum by enhancing communication across disciplines as well as articulation across grade levels.

The session ended with a call to lunch.

Thursday Afternoon: Session 1

Discussion Question: To what extent must the identification of educational needs be a political process? To what extent does it involve a clarification of basic national values? To what extent can and should it be an objective process?

Chairman Tyler opened the meeting by acknowledging the dissatisfaction of some participants with the lack of closure in discussion and argumentation. He sympathized with the feelings of discomfort over the limitations and constraints of format, but he reminded the group that the purpose of discussion was illumination, not a conclusive and agreed upon set of policy recommendations for NIE.

Tyll van Geel then began the topical discussion by expressing the view that education is unavoidably a political process. Because this is the case, the process of decision-making is crucial, and government should undertake to formulate policy publicly, to provide better information on grants, to insure more open competition, and to provide reasons for its choices in grant-giving.

Lauren Resnick agreed that education is inescapably part of a political process, but she suggested that the process ought not to proceed in ignorance. Government agencies, NIE in particular, should provide easy access to crucial information for both professionals and parents.

John Maxwell added an "Amen" to Resnick's recommendation for improved information collection and dissemination. He reiterated his earlier claim that teachers of English badly need information about the conditions of learning; he requested "base-line data."

Tom Green then made a statement that incurred some disagreement and sporadic argumentation. He declared that needs identification was not a political process.

Chairman Tyler argued that, on the contrary, what one sees as a need is partially the product of a political process.

George Archibald set out two sorts of political purposes in the identification of educational needs: large group and small group pressures for major social change or for personal aggrandizement. He expressed the opinion that the Federal government had too often been unwittingly involved in the quest for personal gain and/or

massive social change and that NIE could perform a service by helping to create diversity and options.

Edith Schwartz voiced shock at Archibald's opinions. She challenged the notion that all curriculum developers are "in it" for their own gain, declaring that Archibald's attitude was "negative." In answer, Archibald insisted that there was a positive note in his speech that should not be overlooked, namely that NIE could purposefully contribute to meaningful diversity.

Harry Wugalter suggested that some distinction should be made between wants and needs, that NIE must ask who should identify needs, and that we must be aware that many improvements in education are induced not by educational professionals and systems but by the business and political worlds. Educators must make an attempt to assess needs reasonably and to evaluate programs responsibly.

Harry Broudy introduced some wry humor by asking, plaintively, whether it was "improper to speak about 'knowledge' in relation to the curriculum." He averred that there are two areas in which non-political means are used to identify educational needs: the structure of knowledge and the uses of knowledge in everyday life. He pointed out that the decision whether or not to include knowledge in the curriculum is a political decision, but what constitutes knowledge is not. He suggested, further, that we need research on how knowledge functions in everyday life--on e.g., the interpretive uses of knowledge. These nonpolitical areas are significant because school is unique in inducting the young into our knowledge domains and mores.

Larry Senesh agreed that education is highly political, "riddled with vested interest," but he saw Broudy's suggestion that we concentrate our attention on knowledge as a possible means of depoliticizing education. We might ask, he suggested, how knowledge affects private welfare, public welfare, and values in general and then use these considerations to derive policy.

George Archibald challenged the whole set of "nonpolitical" claims by asking: Who identifies the educational needs? Broudy answered that concepts, structures, and working mores are identified within the disciplines and that the functions of knowledge in everyday life could be identified empirically. Archibald took this to mean that Broudy wished to "leave parents out" of the decision-making, but it was clear that this was not either stated or implied by Broudy's remarks. He had merely identified areas in which parents are not, as parents, naturally involved. Dick Schutz attempted to clarify part of the matter by citing studies in which needs had been commonly identified through a variety of means, thus pointing up the possibility of objective identification of needs.

Bob Davis counseled that decision-making within the disciplines is, at least partially, a political process. He cited the present controversy over the recently announced solution of the famous "four color problem." Because computer methods were used in the solution, a dispute arose concerning whether or not to adjudge the solution a "proof." This point was expanded by Jim Shaver who described the political processes within the disciplines of economics

and sociology. He suggested that the supposition that the disciplines were somehow free of internal political controversy is "naive." This matter was essentially resolved by Broudy's observation that we needed, here, to make a distinction among domains; obviously, decisions in physics are made within physics (whether politically or not) and not in the larger political domain.

At this stage, Clarence Blount suggested that the political process is pervasive in today's world. He pointed out the increase in the use of elective machinery in choosing school superintendents and boards, the increase in legislative involvement in education, and the impact of union activity on politicization.

David Williams noted that there is a gap between our general role as advocates of children and our adversarial roles, e.g., parent vs. teacher. He, too, felt that education is highly politicized, that even getting into schools and classrooms is a highly political process, requiring persuasion and debate.

Paul Hurd challenged George Archibald's description of the workings of curriculum projects. Hurd described curriculum projects of which he had been a part that made "every effort not to be political." Real efforts had been made in these projects to involve all people concerned. He described curriculum developers as people of "good will," eager to better the lot of children. He suggested, further, that motivation for curriculum development was not solely monetary, but professional, that it was directed toward testing hypotheses, attempting to increase learning and to maximize interest.

Edith Schwartz pointed out that a successful political process was required, however, to fund such programs and to implement them.

Archibald stated that the Human Science program had been funded by NSF, but Hurd countered that five years of work at his own expense had preceded any consideration of NSF funding. Archibald persisted in his claim that the Human Science program is highly controversial and that it represents an instance of using all the people's money for material not wanted by many parents. Edith Schwartz defended the expenditure of monies for controversial programs; she suggested that, perhaps, objecting parents need reeducation.

Gloria Frazier attempted to redirect the discussion to NIE's possible role in curriculum development. She felt that NIE could play a prominent role in the dissemination of information about research--in providing access to information which is available.

Stephen Bailey commented that almost everything which had been said so far is true in some domain. He felt that the central mission of NIE might properly be to get at fundamental and common needs. There is no way, he suggested, to identify basic national values without ambiguity, and this realization forces us to use persuasion instead of coercion. He endorsed the notion of NIE's supporting a diversity of quality programs.

Bill Boyd introduced a hopeful note. Sometimes, he suggested, outcomes of curriculum projects are better when the process has been somewhat political. In the same vein, Decker Walker suggested that we might sensibly ask, What kind of politics shall we use? rather than,

How can we exclude politics from the process? A frankly politicized process would tend to open things up.

Roy Millenson pointed out that some government agencies, e.g., the Small Business Administration, will not give aid to "opinion makers" such as newspapers, etc. because they feel such grants would violate the First Admendment. This might be a precedent for NIE to keep in mind as it formulates policy.

Ann Kahn concluded the session by observing that controversial programs might be funded if that support were balanced with fuller public participation, open hearings, and continuing dialogue at a variety of levels.

A recess was then declared.

Thursday Afternoon: Session 2

Discussion Question: How can educational development activities contribute to achieving needed educational improvements?

Roy Millenson opened the session by suggesting a way in which textbook makers can help in assessing needs. Since their salespeople visit all of the schools, they can serve as collectors of information about perceived needs.

Following this, Decker Walker spoke in favor of texts, guides and references. These tools provide help for beginning teachers, and they also contribute to an economical use of teacher time. Teachers simply do not have time to do everything on their own that can be done with a well organized textbook.

Jim Gates felt that teachers should be involved in curriculum development, but that they need time to do this: textbooks do help here.

Bob Davis reminded the group that there remain "nitty-gritty" problems of curriculum to be solved. We need to decide where and by whom curriculum decisions will be made. He agreed with Dave Seeley's earlier warning that we should avoid a "muddled middle"; rather we need to create good, real alternatives. But the problem remains: Where does curriculum find a home? Who shall take the responsibility to train teachers adequately?

David Darland asked what percent of curriculum is verified by learner acquisition before it is imposed.

There followed comments and questions. Tyler answered that the whole matter is difficult because the effectiveness of a curriculum seems to be teacher-dependent. Richard Schutz commented that the concept is new, and therefore little of the existing curriculum had been so verified. Decker Walker asked for a definition of "learner verified." John Maxwell offered the notion that "one sign" of learner verification is that "the kids don't throw the stuff away." And Chairman Tyler agreed that the concept is a difficult one. Darland recommended that NIE should support basic research on conceptualization of the problem.

Joyce Lewis commented that, while elementary classrooms are generally "exciting", high school classes are just as generally dismal and she saw this as an area needing improvement.

Two areas of needed improvement were identified by John Maxwell. He mentioned the need for tested models of in-service education and the development of teacher resource centers.

Frank Chase felt that educational development could contribute to the latitude of choice in curriculum. NSF programs broadened our perspectives, enlarged options. But training programs sometimes go wrong. Teachers return from training programs and lecture on the new materials instead of using new pedagogical techniques. Training in pedagogy must keep pace with progress in curriculum.

Jim Gates seconded Maxwell's recommendations on teacher centers and models of in-service education. He saw a need for research on teacher effectiveness before institutes could really be useful. He cited elementary school mathematics as an area needing further improvement.

Lauren Resnick suggested that educational development might provide a bridge between research and practice, providing two-way information from one domain to the other.

Peter Dow urged the group to consider deeper ideological issues. He expressed worry over our "sensitivity" in the matter of trying to bring about social change. He felt that there is a need for government to speak courageously about national needs, that many areas of ignorance exist in our population and that failure to identify these needs provides motivation for curriculum development. Decker Walker commented, at a later moment, that there is a "fine line between courage and self-righteous foolhardiness"--that one needs to verify the availability of support before launching into such programs.

John Wirt noted that national curriculum projects influence not only the schools--through curriculum itself--but the whole

educational enterprise at a variety of levels, e.g., teacher education and certification.

Clarence Blount did some one-person role-playing. He first cast himself, realistically, as legislator and addressed a question to the educational developer: How will your educational development project improve education? He then suggested acceptable answers for the developer to provide: The project may yield improved student achievement, better teachers, increased creativity in teachers, increased ability of teachers to provide for a variety of learning styles and abilities, increased interest among teachers and students, lower teacher and student drop-out rates.

Herb Kliebard expressed a concern for curriculum as a whole. He felt that, in general, it is a mistake to start our thinking with major national problems or with restricted learning problems. We should, rather, start with <u>education</u> and what it <u>means</u> to be educated.

John Valentine noted that curriculum developers should not forget the colleges since they still exercise considerable influence on the high school program. He suggested that there is a need to examine the objectives of both higher education and secondary education and to try to discern their relationships. Tyler agreed that this recommendation is especially well taken in light of the trend to defer identification of the college bound to later and later ages.

David Darland posed a paradox. Teachers do want significant change in education, yet they seem to resist many changes. He suggested that teachers resist <u>imposed</u> changes, that they must be involved sensitively

and significantly in curriculum development, that there must be a recognition of teacher needs as well as student needs.

Peter Dow returned to the question of identifying national priorities. He insisted that we need to talk about what kind of society we want, what sort of changes we expect education to produce. The school, he felt, has lost its function as a change agent.

Frank Chase asked whether the sort of essay Charles and Mary Beard did on the purposes of education would be relevant, and Dow answered in the affirmative--"something of that sort--we had it in the past." Chairman Tyler noted that, while curriculum development might have to be preceded by the sort of philosophical debate envisioned by Dow, it must also be accompanied by activity which would arouse the interest of communities in its acceptance and implementation. Dow acknowledged this but expressed the opinion that we know a good deal about "engineering change." What we need to know is what sort of change we want.

John Wirt noted that the reforms of the sixties started with particular problems in particular subjects. It is difficult to define goals for all of secondary education. To do so would require first the definition of social policy, then the definition of high school goals, then the provision of resources.

John Maxwell expressed a sense of loss at the demise of the Educational Policies Commission. This group, he felt, provided some of the discussion now longed for. Tyler stated that the Commission died when the educational body split into labor vs. management.

David Darland suggested that it died when N.E.A. discovered that it could make policy and not just implement policies of administrators. He went on to mention several problems of the modern world (time-space collapse, our ability to live outside the biosphere, our ability to "modify behavior at will") which, perhaps, make our assumptions about education obsolete or wrong. Maxwell, however, returned to his earlier theme. We need someone, he felt, to give us a firm, coherent design, a framework within which we can react.

Donald Barr raised several questions: Will books cease to be written without grants or titles? Can we develop English and social studies curricula as we did curricula in the sciences and mathematics, or is this approach a mistake?

Herb Kliebard accepted Chairman Tyler's invitation to "have the last word." He agreed that we need study on policy issues but warned that the results may be too general. We might do better to look directly at the needs of various groups in our society and try to derive policy from these.

Thursday Afternoon: Summary Session

As on Wednesday afternoon, time was provided for those not returning on Friday to state their recommendations to NIE.

Lillian Weber prefaced her recommendations with an attempt to clarify a point. She felt that people often think of controversial curriculum projects and open education as synonymous. This, she said, is wrong.

She recommended that NIE do the following:

(1) Provide ways to ease access to classrooms for purposes of research on learner verification.

(2) Provide reports on all attempts to increase access.

(3) Provide support for teacher resource centers at which teachers can develop and try out materials.

Denis Driscoll made the following recommendations:

(1) NIE should foster diversity of curriculum within agreed upon philosophical guidelines; help to develop policy guidelines for each level of curriculum worker; help to increase effective options at local level.

(2) NIE should support in-service education.

Additionally, although he was unwilling to cast his remarks as a specific recommendation, Driscoll saw parent participation as a crucial point for NIE consideration.

In the discussion that followed, Gary Sykes asked a series of questions about experimentation. How can a teacher decide what it is that made a particular lesson a success or failure? Why does a thing work once and not another time? Weber responded that teachers need time to build depth with materials, time to experiment with the materials themselves and not just with the children. Tyler affirmed the need of teachers to become familiar enough with materials so that they feel comfortable with them and can be sure they will not make fools of themselves when they work with them in front of a class. This is a need which can be at least partially filled through teacher resource centers.

Jim Shaver commented that we need research on cognitive styles, personality styles, and their interrelationships. He suggested that we can hardly "meet kids where they are" if we have no reliable background information on where kids are with respect to the styles mentioned.

Marc Tucker expressed the opinion that a great merit of the teacher center might be its contribution to the breaking down of the isolation felt by so many teachers.

Peter Dow added a personal feeling on this matter. Each of us, he suggested, wants to know: What makes me effective as a teacher? We need to understand not only where the child is but where we, as teachers, are.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Friday Morning:

By agreement reached on Thursday, the pre-planned agenda for Friday was abandoned, and the first session was devoted to an oral summary of the Wednesday and Thursday sessions. This summary was presented by Henry M. Brickell who was also to prepare a brief written summary of the proceedings for circulation at a later date. * Since a full account of the proceedings appears here, the Friday summary will not be included. The summary was well received and no substantive corrections were suggested.

The participants were, however, somewhat overwhelmed by the volume and variety of statements that were revealed in the summary account of what had been said. Frank Chase expressed a feeling of "futility" over the whole exercise. Too many views! Too few connections! Arthur Lee asked whether the summary could be translated into a form useful to NIE and, eventually, to NCER. Brickell responded that the summary committee had been careful not to interpret or to extrapolate. It seemed proper and important to confront the participants with what had actually been said. Chairman Tyler commented that this result was predictable and, indeed, almost inevitable given the charge to the participants and the nature of the conference.

---

*This summary is available upon request from Jon Schaffarzick, Chairman, NIE Curriculum Development Task Force, National Institute of Education, 1200 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20208

As the discussion proceeded, it became clear that there were two major opinions about how the proceedings should be reported; these were summarized by Tyler: (1) Some synthesis should be attempted in order that the conference should have an impact and enable NIE "to move." (2) No synthesis should be attempted; rather, the observed diversity should be faithfully reported.

Carl Dolce summarized what he felt were the outcomes of the conference. The conference, he said, had illustrated differences and conflicting ideologies, it had pointed up vested interests, it had illustrated vividly what we in education have to contend with and what government has to contend with. He concluded by observing that there were no really extreme views expressed, that "we, here, are establishment people," and yet we could not agree.

Others agreed that, while the discussion ranged over many topics and problems, the conference represented a start--a springboard for further discussion, in Edith Schwartz's view.

Tyll van Geel suggested that data be gleaned from the summary and analyzed in three main categories: goals and values, methods, factual assumptions. He recognized that such an analysis posed a risk of bias but felt the attempt had to be made if the main purpose of the conference--to clarify issues--was to be fulfilled.

Donald Barr spoke in favor of the summary as it had been given. He felt that the expressed differences represented important information for NIE, that the record counseled caution to government, that government policy--in light of it--should be

modest. He made a plea that the statements of the conferees not be reduced to data.

Herb Kliebard added that any "coherent story" of the conference would have introduced an interpretation, since the conference was simply not the sort of event which can be narrated both coherently and accurately.

Larry Senesh felt that the diversity of opinions and the summary which accurately reflected that diversity were stimulating, that given time and further discussion a clear direction might be found.

Frank Chase attempted to clarify his earlier statement about the need for synthesis. He felt that many of the statements made at the conference represented "unexamined" views, that there had not been sufficient opportunity to dig beneath the surface of these statements for consistent foundations and adequate reasoning. He urged that the issues still needed identification and their logical bases explication.

Harry Broudy picked up Chase's use of the term "unexamined" and agreed that he, too, felt the lack of reasons for various positions advocated. He suggested that an identification of constituencies might help readers of the summaries to infer reasons for stated positions.

Ruby Martin suggested that, although we speak with some favor about pluralism, we may not accept pluralism as a fact. If we did,

she felt, we could deal with the problems of diversity that have arisen.

Larry Senesh again expressed the opinion that consensus could be reached, given persistence and time. He agreed with Broudy that one needed to know the reasons for positions taken in order to assess the adequacy and importance of recommendations, and he noted that "odd alliances" are formed on a large variety of issues. People make similar recommendations and take similar positions but for very different reasons. To reach consensus, a group must talk long enough to learn where the real differences lie.

Donald Barr urged that no attempt be made to seek consensus. "Consensus" usually leaves the field to the professionals and other valuable opinions are lost.

Tyler asked the group whether the summarizer should be asked to make an attempt to clarifying issues. Carl Dolce felt this would be "deceptive." Again, in the absence of reasons stated by participants, an attempt by the summarizer to provide clarification might easily have the effect of subverting reasons. Tyler explained that he did not intend that the summarizer should actually define terms such as "parent participation" or "basic education" but simply point up the fact that an issue exists in certain areas.

Ann Kahn felt that the sort of classification suggested by Tyler would be acceptable provided interpretation is avoided. The diversity and controversy expressed must be preserved.

Richard Schutz agreed with Dolce that something might be lost in an attempt to clarify through reduction. Donald Barr asked whether NCER members would "be obliged" to read the commissioned papers in their entirety. Arthur Lee answered that Council members would "probably not" read the papers. He felt that one purpose of the conference was "to digest" this material so that Council members would not have to repeat the entire task.

Michael Timpane thought that the cautionary words about attempting clarification and classification were well taken. He observed that NIE would have to do this anyway and that it might better be done at a later stage.

Arthur Lee concluded the discussion by noting that some organization would help both NIE and NCER in their work.

Chairman Tyler next invited the participants to read their one-minute prepared statement of recommendations to NIE. These statements appear in their entirety in Appendix C, and the reader is referred there for an account of this part of the conference.

Friday Afternoon

Following the presentation of prepared statements, discussion on the recommendations was invited.

Bob Davis made another plea in favor of development work. He pointed out that we really cannot "start with science," that the process of development itself raises questions for research, and

that the history of development in all sorts of things (beer making, cathedral building, teaching reading) shows that we become quite good at doing things before detailed research is undertaken. Therefore, we should not make the mistake of deferring curriculum development until some "essential research" is completed.

Joyce Lewis pointed out that almost no discussion had evolved on an issue she thought to be significant: the growing trend toward unionization and collective bargaining. Tyll van Geel agreed the matter would be increasingly important in the area of curriculum, since unions are persisting in the attempt to get curriculum issues "on the table." He stated that union leaders were themselves divided on the question whether curriculum issues should be included in negotiations.

David Williams suggested that, whether curriculum matters are negotiated or not, time has to be found for teachers to engage in curriculum work. Teachers may feel they are forced to solicit the help of unions in getting this needed time.

Frank Chase discussed the trend toward cooperative, local development of curriculum. He described the work of the Dallas Alliance as an example of cooperation between regional development labs and school systems and between school and community. He pointed out, further, that people are now being heard at the local level and that, increasingly, people who are interested have a real voice in curriculum matters.

Ron Brandt followed up on Chase's discussion of local trends by suggesting that we need further careful discussion on just how far we should go in providing diversity in education, and Chairman Tyler agreed that we need to recognize some necessary commonalities if we are to retain an identity as a national society.

John Valentine endorsed the notion that there is value in some uniformity. He pointed out that one danger of too much diversity is that it can actually limit opportunities for upward mobility by restricting access to the usual channels of mobility, e.g. college entrance.

Harry Broudy made an attempt to identify "good" elements in diversity, e.g. originality, freedom, spontaneity, and "bad" elements in diversity, e.g. mindless indulgence in innovation for its own sake. Similarly, he said, there is a "good" and "bad" uniformity. But we must realize that too many "publics" destroy the very meaning of "public."

Tyler suggested that we might consider desirable that diversity which increases real options for students. He expressed opposition to any form of schooling which would tend to close doors rather than to open them.

Todd Endo expressed the opinion that much of the discussion on diversity was irrelevant. Referring to Cuban's paper, he noted that not much diversity was actually in effect anyway. Schools, he suggested, are still rather repressive and conservative, and

we need to get on with the business of actually providing options instead of talking on a theoretical level about the "goodness" of diversity.

Larry Senesh thought that our real task is to identify and provide particular options that will be consonant with the goals of groups they are designed to serve. There is an obvious need for appropriate balance between uniformity and diversity.

Paul Hurd mentioned the fact that we now have a proliferation of curriculum and course titles, some 4000 in all and 435 in science alone. Yet this creation of courses and titles has not, apparently, solved the problem of providing options.

Decker Walker mentioned a book, Alternatives in English, by George Hillocks which discusses both the advantages and dangers involved in providing a variety of options. There is a definite danger in providing options where there is no provision for evaluating or monitoring them. He replied, also, to Endo's earlier comments about the practical aspects of providing diversity, contending, in opposition to Endo's plea, that more--not less--serious discussion had to be undertaken at the theoretical level. Until we know whether we want diversity, who wants how much and what kind of diversity, and what we expect to gain from its provision, it hardly makes sense to rush into providing it.

Tyler pointed out that there are, also, good and bad motives for exercising certain choices. One may, he noted, take journalism

in order to learn to write or in order to avoid another kind of writing which is distasteful. This problem of individual motives complicates the problem of providing options.

Ron Brandt commented that, for him at least, the discussion about diversity was not a theoretical one but highly practical, that it involved problems he had to cope with daily. To this, Edith Schwartz replied that she felt "just the opposite," that we are badly in need of action, that too often talk took the place of necessary action.

At this point, Larry Senesh asked to provide a clarification of his own use of diversity. He had spoken of diversity in terms of cultural diversity, but he also meant to refer to the provision of options which would open new doors to students as well as to options which would be provided in recognition of cultural diversity. Tyler said that the "new-doors-options" sense agreed with his own emphasis in use of the term.

Schwartz continued by noting that diversity can be provided even within highly structured courses by providing options, e.g. how students will handle the required material, how teachers deal with instruction.

John Valentine commented that we need an emphasis on learning itself, on how to learn, on wanting to learn. One fears that our school programs sometimes induce dependency in learning situations rather than the independence required for life-long learning.

Judy Herman suggested that teachers should either be paid or given some form of extra credit for work in curriculum development. Such a gesture would show that curriculum work is valued.

Senesh felt, however, that teachers cannot be involved profitably in the actual development of curriculum. Teacher-produced materials are not of good quality. They must be aided by subject matter experts.

Clarence Blount felt that the conferees had left out a set of crucial personalities in the curriculum scene, namely administrators. If principals are not properly trained and motivated to be instructional leaders, the training of teachers may be wasted, for they will not receive the support they need to do a good job. The principal sets the tone for the atmosphere of the school.

Paul Hurd returned to Senesh's discussion of problems with teachers. Teachers, Hurd suggested, lack conviction about what and how to teach; they are confused about both goals and methods by which to reach them.

The question of educational leadership arose again in an unexpected way. Decker Walker asked a question about the advent of computer generated printing and resulting cost reduction, suggesting that this development ought to make easier the process of providing alternative arrangements of texts. Roy Millenson responded that, so far as he knew, there was no saving in cost involved. And, then, Edith Schwartz challenged the whole notion of allowing individual schools or faculties to remove unwanted sections of texts. She felt

educators must exercise some leadership to insure that all students were exposed to the best curricula we can provide. This challenge is emphasized here to underscore the fact that the basic ideological difference noted at the beginning of the conference persisted right to the end.

Millenson said that the reality of the situation is that the big adoption states determine what is printed. Some small states are presented with a pre-determined batch of materials from which they must make their selections.

Ellen Moyer expressed some concern about spending the money of all the people for products of interest to only a few. She felt this was an important area for NIE to consider before it entered the field of curriculum development. She felt that any program funded by the government should be able to demonstrate that it enhances education somehow throughout the country.

Senesh felt that there was another dimension to the problem of protection. Yes, the people in general should be protected; the materials should be put in the public domain to be chosen or rejected. But the innovator's integrity should be preserved; he should be able to continue work on his project--to improve, refine, revise.

Bob Davis pointed out that development costs, e.g., of aircraft, are often picked up by government. Indeed, development may not occur at all without government help.

Bill Boyd counseled, however, that we must be sure that the expected benefits warrant the increased centralization inherent in government involvement in development.

Clarence Blount suggested that the government's obligation to insure all of its citizens a decent education could provide justification for its involvement in curriculum development. John Mays stated that the ideas advanced by Blount are actually incorporated in the preamble to the legislation establishing the NIE. Decker Walker suggested, further, that the question of Federal involvement is frequently one of economics; some states simply cannot afford to fund what they could effectively use if the Federal government took care of development costs.

Larry Cuban asked a question motivated by his own research: Why fund programs which are not effectively implemented anyway?

Nelle Taylor suggested that some programs have had important impact. She mentioned, in particular, Title 1 and ESL as programs which have had real effects. She wondered why these had not been discussed. Chairman Tyler suggested that it was because these programs did not involve definite curricula that they had not been discussed.

Harry Broudy commented that he was somewhat appalled by the faulty expectations people held with respect to educational change. Change, he stated, is predictably slow. Texts are determined for periods of at least five years. Teacher behavior

is extremely hard to change, requiring perhaps a new generation of teachers.

Bob Davis acknowledged the correctness of Broudy's statement. He said that some curriculum developers do expect that twenty years will be required to reach their goals. Tyler endorsed this trend by noting that the sixties programs vastly underestimated the time and effort required to produce real change.

Peter Dow said that he felt NIE had a dual responsibility: first, it should provide equal treatment for all constituencies; second, it should recognize excellence. The first is a political responsibility; the second is a professional responsibility which NIE must not neglect.

Chairman Tyler then turned the meeting over to Jon Schaffarzick who, with Gary Sykes, posed some questions of special interest to NIE:

Can teachers do curriculum development work or is teacher work in curriculum inevitably poor?

Tyler said that there were two different areas discussed: the creation of curriculum, in which it was felt by many participants that subject matter expertise was needed, and the selection and adaptation of materials in which teacher participation was vital.

Frank Chase said that he felt it was the exceptional teacher in unusual circumstances who made a creative contribution, but

still such contributions were not sufficiently solicited and supported.

Larry Senesh attempted to answer the question directly. He felt there were three main areas in which teachers had been or might be involved in curriculum work--adaptation of national materials to local situations, the relating of concepts to children's experience, and the development of local materials. Teachers did a poor job, he found, in all of these areas. Nothing short of a complete revision of pre-service teacher education will remedy this situation, he felt.

Donald Barr suggested that the unusually able and creative teacher is inhibited many times by his colleagues. Teachers have, in a sense, organized to diminish competition. Some of the tasks teachers undertake in private school settings are "illegal" in organized public schools.

Lloyd Trump demurred at all this. He said that it is possible to reorganize a school to use the instructional competence of teachers optimally. Clarence Blount agreed, but he noted that, after training the competent teacher so that he or she "shines," we lose the teacher to a higher job.

Sykes and Schaffarzick produced another question of great interest to NIE: How shall we decide what kinds of programs to fund?

Donald Barr reminded the group of an earlier powerful argument against Federal involvement where large national needs had been

identified. In these areas, he said, it made sense to let the private sector handle things, since where the need is great and recognized, there will be enough profit to make the enterprise worthwhile. Where needs are not so large or where they are highly specialized, perhaps it does make sense for the Federal government to be involved.

Peter Dow suggested that there is a level of need between the great national need and the smaller, specialized need; this need involves the support of excellence. NIE might help the pedagogical disciplines to define their goals.

Decker Walker felt that NIE might help by maintaining dialogue in controversial areas, e.g., on needs. NIE should not decide upon or identify national needs; it should support discussion and participation at all appropriate levels.

Tyler pointed out that it is also important to decide which needs are needs that can be filled by the school and which should properly be filled elsewhere. NIE might contribute something of value by supporting research on where these problems are so that we have adequate information upon which to base decisions.

The conference was adjourned with Jon Schaffarzick's thanks to Ralph Tyler and to the other participants. He reminded participants that they were invited to submit further ideas in writing and to make comments on the summaries which would eventually be circulated. It was NIE's intention, he said, to keep the dialogue open right up to decision time.

IV RECOMMENDATIONS TO NIE

Since the recommendations of each participant appear in the appendices, individual recommendations will not be considered here. Instead, an attempt will be made to relate clusters of recommendations to the NIE Curriculum Policy Discussion Guides* and to outline the variety of reasons given for major recommendations.

The conferees did not directly address the first question in the policy guides: "How should NIE define 'curriculum'?" There was considerable discussion about the extent of learning outside of school and about incidental learning in school, but most participants seemed to accept, implicitly, a variation on the first definition suggested in the Guides; that is, the recorded discussion suggests that the conferees regarded curriculum as materials and experiences prepared, selected, and intended for instruction. Most of what follows is best understood with this definition in mind. The reader should note, however, that some participants, e.g. Brown, Herman, Taylor, did urge NIE to give some thought and aid to "curriculum" in the larger community, e.g., to the quality of television programming.

In answer to Question 2: "Should NIE develop new curricula?," the conferees were plainly divided and scattered over the entire range suggested in the Guide. There were more than a few participants who counseled NIE to "do nothing" by way of direct curriculum development. Some softened that stance to recommend that NIE not

---

*See the summary guide in Appendix D.

engage in the development or funding of curricula designed to promote social change or at least, that NIE not grant funds for the purpose of inducing changes in values. Some felt that NIE would do better to support indigenous initiative in curriculum development. It is interesting to note that those who recommended against NIE's direct involvement in curriculum development or who entered strong caveats about any such involvement included professors, administrators, parents, and public policy makers. Obviously, their reasons varied greatly, but among reasons mentioned were the following: distaste for further centralization and fear of further loss of local initiative; clear limitations in monies available; a feeling that NIE should not engage in implementation efforts for projects it might fund (thereby placing itself in the position of "selling" products) but an equally strong feeling that projects funded without implementation efforts were doomed to failure; a claim that not enough is known about learning itself and about classroom dynamics to encourage large scale curriculum development work; adherence to principles of "basic moral rights" which, it is feared, may be violated by government sponsorship of curriculum projects.

Some nonpolar recommendations are important and should be noted. Many participants thought that NIE might properly be involved in the development of curriculum, in areas where needs have been clearly identified and where the private sector, for whatever reason, is unlikely to respond. Among those areas mentioned were bilingual education, education for the handicapped, and education in basic skills. Some felt that NIE could properly fund small projects in

the interest of increasing diversity in available materials and, thereby, accommodate a healthy pluralism. Still other reasons were given for promoting small projects: creative innovators might be identified and encouraged, options for local selection would be increased, pressures to buy might be reduced, the number of well-trained curriculum workers might be increased.

Finally, there were those who felt that NIE should be directly involved in curriculum development on any scale congruent with its capacity to fund. Several very different categories of reasons were offered for this stance. First, it was pointed out by several conferees, the Federal government has a responsibility to educate all of its citizens; some states and local areas simply cannot afford to engage in development activities and, therefore, government must be involved. Second, there are what Robert Davis referred to as "nitty-gritty problems" of curriculum. Who will translate the definitions, interpret the concepts, and transform the structures of the disciplines for sound pedagogical use? Strong incentives and support are needed to insure high quality curricula which embody newly created knowledge and reflect important changes of orientation in the disciplines themselves as well as in teaching-learning theory. Finally, it was suggested by at least one participant that education is properly subversive and that government, through education, should lead the way to its own vision of a better society; hence, again, it has a responsibility to lead in curriculum development.

There was not a great deal of discussion on Question 3: "Should NIE evaluate curricula?" Participants seemed to recognize several difficulties in evaluation, e.g., its costliness, the limitations in its tested techniques, the tenuousness of some of its newer methods (see, e.g., the discussion on "learner validation"). But several conferees recommended that NIE fund research on evaluation methodology, and several others recommended that NIE devise mechanisms for monitoring, reporting, and feeding back information in the area of evaluation.

Discussion relevant to Question 4: "Should NIE help implement new curricula?" is not entirely separable from the question of evaluation. How does one fairly evaluate a curriculum without considering the quality of its implementation? Participants recognized this difficulty and, also, the possible conflicts induced by trying to fund initiation, implementation, and evaluation of curricula. On the other hand, many conferees noted the importance of the role played by teachers in implementing curricula and recommended that NIE do something to increase the effectiveness of teachers in handling available curricula. Suggestions ranged over the following: strengthen teacher training institutions, encourage total revision of pre-service education, aid in-service programs, support the establishment of "teacher centers" in which teachers can become better acquainted with materials. Again, there were statements of polar positions: (1) fund both development and implementation of high quality curricula, and (2) stay entirely out of implementation.

Much of the conference discussion was related to Question 5: "Who should plan curriculum activities with NIE?" The Discussion Guide lists nine groups which might be involved and, it is fair to say, someone spoke on behalf of every one of the nine's participating. It was recommended that NIE work closely with established agencies and organizations, that NIE support local initiative, and that NIE make an effort to involve parents and teachers in more significant participation in curriculum matters. Emphases differed. Some emphasized the importance of teacher involvement, some of scholarly involvement, some of parent involvement. Some emphasized the inevitability of involvement of a group not mentioned in the Guides, namely legislators. It was suggested that legislatures and the judiciary would become increasingly involved in curriculum matters if the perceived lack of responsiveness to certain groups continued.

Suggestions about parent participation were, perhaps, most frequently made, but they were often, and perhaps unavoidably, vague. Parent involvement was seen as a crucial area for NIE's attention, but suggestions as to how this involvement might be secured were various and, sometimes, in conflict. There were some who felt that parents could be intimately involved--along with students and teachers--in the manipulation and refinement of generic materials; some who felt that parents should have ultimate control in the choice of values to be included in curricula; some who felt that parents should have a voice in the choice of content and scope for curriculum, and many who felt that, minimally, NIE should support continued discussion at all levels on curriculum matters so that individual parents could learn about proposed curriculum changes and express themselves on all kinds of curriculum matters.

Teacher involvement was seen as important but problematic. Some suggested that teachers lack the training and/or ability to do significant curriculum work; some that teachers lack the time and need incentives by way of increased pay and/or released time for such work; some that teachers need not be involved in development but must be trained for implementation; some that no training for implementation could compensate for lack of participation in development.

Clearly, there is a need for NIE to learn more about just how various individuals and groups can participate effectively and to their own satisfaction in curriculum matters. Just as clearly, NIE's efforts so far to secure opinions and advice from a variety of groups were seen by most participants as highly laudable--a practice to be continued.

Again, on Question 6: "How much curriculum leadership should NIE exert?" the participants were divided. Some of the arguments for NIE initiative have already been presented, but there were others. Some, for example, suggested that NIE, as a government agency, is in a unique position to identify curriculum needs and encourage action on them. On the opposing side, others suggested that just because NIE is a government agency, it should stay away from identifying needs and making initiatives. It should, rather, react to well-considered initiatives from groups properly constituted to do this work, e.g., state and local R & D's, development labs, individual scholars. As usual, many conferees steered a middle course, recommending that NIE not actually engage in identifying needs but initiate curriculum activity in areas where needs had already been identified--perhaps by other agencies of government.

On Question 7: "Who should perform curriculum activities for NIE?" participants again held diverse opinions. Some felt that the private sector, e.g., publishers, scholar-writers, could handle any curriculum task posed; others felt that the private sector necessarily played to the mode, and any truly innovative program would have to come from a group or individual operating on a nonprofit basis. A more moderate segment held that the private sector can handle most significant projects but that special groups might have to be funded by government to develop special projects, such as curricula for the handicapped or for minorities. But should the private sector work for NIE? Again, varying opinions were advanced. Some participants felt that any group should be allowed to compete for NIE funding (if NIE does in fact fund development projects) and that NIE should concentrate on making public its description of significant problems, criteria for selection of proposals, guidelines for successful proposal making, and announcement of winners together with reasons for their selection.

If there was any trend in the recommendations, it seemed to lie in the direction of seeking diversity: diversity in viewpoints with respect to value positions, diversity in kinds of groups funded, diversity in models of development, diversity in outcomes sought. There was an expressed desire for a variety of attacks on the problems of curriculum--a wish to move away from what Kliebard called the "one best way" model. Even here, however, there were those who cautioned that subject matter expertise should not be abandoned simply because it is the earmark of the "prevailing model."

It will be required, they advised, in any successful curriculum development project.

Finally, some conferees suggested that, if NIE makes it possible for all sorts of groups to compete for funding, it (or some group) will have to consider ways of bringing some unity to all this diversity. Otherwise, we risk losing our sense of national identity, and the schools may lose the very qualities that make them "public."

Question 8 in the Guides asked: "Should NIE emphasize research, development, or implementation?" Indirectly, much of the discussion revolved around this question. The reader may recall the caveats entered concerning development activities and the fears of coercion expressed concerning implementation. Interestingly, the caveats and fears about research were fewer. There were some significant ones, however. Some participants felt that research represented a form of "theorizing" that too often took the place of action, that NIE had to help in moving things. Others noted that research did not, in our practical history, precede development but that the two endeavors have been transactive--each contributing to the advancement of the other. We should not, therefore, defer development until "the research is complete."

Many participants called for NIE to fund further research: on teaching and classroom dynamics, on learning and the conditions of learning, on evaluation, on curriculum development itself, on conceptual problems of curriculum, in the area of futures, on educational reforms, on the uses of knowledge, on what it takes to create an

enlightened citizenry. They suggested forms of research, e.g., basic research, decision-oriented research, longitudinal studies.

One may discern two important and very different attitudes among the participants in their views of research, development, and implementation. One view links development more closely with research, seeing the two as stages in a single endeavor; the other links development more closely with implementation. The first prizes knowledge as an outcome; the second demands improved practice. While possibly no participant came at curriculum entirely from one of these views, the difference in emphasis was pronounced. Some of those in the second camp were disenchanted with curriculum development projects that had failed to have a real impact on classroom practice. Why bother with development projects, they asked, when so few real changes take place in the classroom? Those in the first group are likely to reply that we learn from these projects, that significant change is accomplished slowly, that more R & D work is necessary.

In its Discussion Guide, #8, NIE states: "The ultimate purpose of research and development activities in education is to improve practice. About that there is no doubt." But there is some doubt, apparently, about the role of development in that sequence. If development and research are seen as parts of an integral enterprise, one would expect smaller and more diverse projects, more risks and failures and, perhaps, greater emphasis on professional rather than lay participation. If development is seen as a bridge between research and practice, then one might expect, perhaps, fewer risks and

fewer failures, larger projects with better defined goals, and greater participation by all those whose efforts are required to insure success. It is possible that NIE might support both orientations, but it might properly hold different expectations for the two.

Question 9 asks: "How should NIE divide its development efforts?" Since the debate centered upon whether NIE should engage in development and upon who should do what in development, little discussion was directed at this question, and some of the suggestions in the Guide were not even mentioned. Some suggestions were made, however, in specific recommendations. There were those, as we have already noted, who recommended that NIE support the development of better substantive content, of better instructional methods, of better instructional materials, and of better methods of teacher training. None of these recommendations, one must remember, escaped a counter-recommendation or suggested restriction.

The final question, #10, asks: "What types of curricula should NIE develop?" Again, it is hard to pick out trends in recommendations without prejudicing previous questions, in particular the fundamental question of whether and to what extent NIE should engage in curriculum development, but the following represent recommendations which received considerable enthusiastic support and some of the "if you must do something do this" sort of support: support development of projects in areas where there is already a mandate, e.g., bilingual education, education for the handicapped; support curriculum development in areas which cannot afford to do so themselves and/or curriculum development

which would tend to equalize opportunity; support curriculum development where a clear need has been identified; do not assume that curriculum development in all subject areas can be treated as mathematics and the sciences have been treated by NSF. The last is, of course, a different kind of recommendation from the others, but it cropped up often enough, in a variety of contexts, to warrant special mention.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS
(other than NIE Staff)

Judy Almquist (parent)
Robert Andringa (Committee on Education and Labor; U. S. House of Representatives)
George Archibald (American Legislative Exchange Council)
Philip Austin (Department of Health, Education and Welfare)
Stephen Bailey (American Council on Education)
Donald Barr (Hackley School)
Clarence Blount (State Senate of Maryland)
Mike Bowler (Baltimore Sun)
William Boyd (University of Rochester)
Ronald Brandt (Lincoln Public Schools)
Henry M. Brickell (Policy Studies in Education)
Harry S. Broudy (University of Illinois)
Gordon L. Brown (Illinois Office of Education)
William Brown (National Association of State Boards of Education)
Joel Burdin (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education)
William Cannon (University of Chicago)
Jose Cardenas (Intercultural Development Research Association)
Frank Chase (Dallas Independent School District)
J. D. Clemmons (Department of Health, Education and Welfare)
Michael G. Cohan (Select Subcommittee on Education; U. S. House of Representatives)
Jesse Coles (South Carolina State Department of Education)
Larry Cuban (Arlington Public Schools)
Jerome Daen (National Science Foundation)
David Darland (National Education Association)
Joseph Dasbach (American Association for the Advancement of Science)
Robert Davis (University of Illinois)
Charles M. Dorn (National Art Education Association)
Peter Dow (Learning Design Associates)
Carl Dolce (North Carolina State University)
Jack Duncan (Select Subcommittee on Education; U. S. House of Representatives)
Denis Driscoll (University of Maryland)
Donald E. Egge (Oregon State Department of Education)
Elliot W. Eisner (Stanford University)
Todd Endo (Arlington Public Schools)
Richard Farrell (Office of Senator Lawton Childs; U. S. Senate)
Gloria Frazier (National Assessment of Educational Progress)
Gregory Fusco (Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; U. S. Senate)
Jean Frohlicher (Subcommittee on Education; U. S. Senate)
Marjorie Gardner (University of Maryland)
William Gaul (Committee on Education and Labor; U. S. House of Representatives)

James Gates (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics)
Thomas F. Green (Syracuse University)
John Hale (National Endowment for the Humanities)
Raymond Hannapel (National Science Foundation)
Carol Hodgson (American Vocational Association, Inc.)
Barbara Howell (Silver Burdett Company)
Paul Hurd (Stanford University)
David Justice (Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education)
Ann Kahn (National PTA)
Herbert Kliebard (University of Wisconsin)
Joyce Lewis (Maine State Legislature)
David Lockard (University of Maryland)
John C. Maxwell (National Council of Teachers of English)
Ruby Martin (U. S. House of Representatives)
Onalee McGraw (National Coalition for Children)
Sterling M. McMurrin (University of Utah)
Roy Millenson (Association of American Publishers)
Robert Miller (U. S. Office of Education)
William Moore (Brightwood Elementary School)
Muriel Morisey (Office of Representative Shirley Chisholm)
Ellen Moyer (Maryland State Board of Education)
Nel Noddings (Los Altos, California)
Migdalia Romero de Ortiz (Hunter College)
Peggy Ott (American Association of School Administrators)
Judy Parsons (Parent)
Suzanne Quick (The Rand Corporation)
Elizabeth S. Randolph (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools)
Marilyn Rauth (American Federation of Teachers)
Lauren Resnick (Learning Research and Development Center)
Wade Robinson (CEMREL, Inc.)
Justin Rodriguez (Department of Health, Education and Welfare)
Stanley Salett (National Committee for Citizens in Education)
Richard Schutz (Southwest Regional Laboratory)
Edith Schwartz (California Curriculum Development and Supplementary Materials Committee)
David Seeley (Public Education Association)
Robert Segura (National Education Task Force de la Raza)
Lawrence Senesh (University of Colorado)
James Shaver (National Council for the Social Studies)
Ron Smith (Education Commission of the States)
Nelle H. Taylor (National Education Association)
Michael Timpane (The Rand Corporation)
John E. Tirrell (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges)
Marlene Torres (Department of Health, Education and Welfare)
J. Lloyd Trump (National Association of Secondary School Principals)
Ralph Tyler (Director Emeritus; Center for Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences)
John Valentine (College Entrance Examination Board)

Tyll van Geel (The University of Rochester)
Decker F. Walker (Stanford University)
Lillian Weber (The City College Workshop Center for Open Education)
David L. Williams (University of Maryland)
Deborah Wolfe (National Alliance of Black School Educators)
Harry Wugalter (Governor's Cabinet; New Mexico)

APPENDIX B

DESIGNATED CENTRAL TABLE PARTICIPANTS

Wednesday, 9:30-11:30
What social, political, and legal forces influence the curriculum and curriculum activities?

Boyd, William
Brown, Gordon
Dolce, Carl
Egge, Donald
Eisner, Elliot
Green, Tom
Hertzler, Elam
Howell, Barbara
Lewis, Joyce
McGough, Kris
Moore, William
Ott, Peggy
Schwartz, Edith
Seeley, David
Segura, Robert
Senesh, Lawrence
Shaver, James
Sykes, Gary (for Larry Cuban)
Valentine, John
van Geel, Tyll
Wirt, John
Wolfe, Deborah

Wednesday, 1:00-2:30
What are the alternative ways of developing curricula?

Barr, Donald
Brandt, Ronald
Cardenas, Jose
Coles, Jesse
Davis, Robert
Dow, Peter
Eisner, Elliot
Gardner, Marjorie
Gates, James
Hannapel, Ray
Herman, Judy
Howell, Barbara
Kliebard, Herbert
Lochard, David
Maxwell, John
Quick, Suzanne
Salett, Stan
Schutz, Richard
Senesh, Lawrence
Taylor, Nelle
Trump, J. Lloyd
Walker, Decker
Weber, Lillian

Wednesday, 2:45-4:15
What are and have been the roles of the Federal government in curriculum development?

Barr, Donald
Blount, Clarence
Brown, Gordon
Chase, Frank
Coles, Jesse
Daen, Jerome
Darland, David
Dasbach, Joe
Davis, Robert
Endo, Todd
Gardner, Marjorie
Gates, James
Hale, John
Hannapel, Ray
Hodgson, Carol
Hurd, Paul
Kliebard, Herbert
Robinson, Wade
Seeley, David
Tirrell, John
Wirt, John

Wednesday, 4:30-5:30
Opportunity for those who will not be returning...

Eisner, Elliot
Howell, Barbara

Thursday, 9:00-10:30
What are American children learning now? Where are they learning it?

Archibald, George
Bailey, Stephen
Broudy, Harry
Brown, Gordon
Chase, Frank
Dorn, Charles
Dolce, Carl
Frazier, Gloria
Hurd, Paul
Kahn, Ann
McGough, Kris
McGraw, Onalee
Randolph, Elizabeth
Rauth, Marilyn
Romero de Ortiz, Migdalia
Salett, Stan
Segura, Robert
Shaver, James
Smith, Paul
Smith, Ron
Timpane, Michael
Valentine, John
Weber, Lillian
Wugalter, Harry

Thursday, 10:45-12:15
What kinds of educational improvements are perceived as needed now?

Barr, Don
Boyd, Bill
Brandt, Ron
Brown, Gordon
Brown, William
Burdin, Joel
Dorn, Charles
Dolce, Carl
Egge, Don
Gardner, Marge
Lewis, Joyce
Maxwell, John
McGough, Kris
McGraw, Onalee
Millenson, Roy
Moore, William
Ott, Peggy
Randolph, Elizabeth
Robinson, Wade
Smith, Paul
Taylor, Nelle
Trump, J. Lloyd
Wolfe, Deborah

Thursday, 1:30-3:00
To what extent must the identification of educational needs be a political process...

Archibald, George
Bailey, Steve
Blount, Clarence
Boyd, Bill
Broudy, Harry
Brown, William
Cannon, Bill
Frazier, Gloria
Green, Tom
Hurd, Paul
Kahn, Ann
McMurrin, Sterling
Resnick, Lauren
Romero de Ortiz, Migdalia
Schutz, Richard
Schwartz, Edith
Seeley, Dave
Timpane, Mike
van Geel, Tyll
Williams, Dave
Smith, Ron

Thursday, 3:15-4:45
How can educational development activities contribute to achieving needed educational improvements?

Blount, Clarence
Cannon, Bill
Cardenas, Jose
Chase, Frank
Coles, Jesse
Darland, Dave
Davis, Robert
Dow, Peter
Driscoll, Denis
Gates, Jim
Hodgson, Carol
Kliebard, Herb
Lewis, Joyce
Maxwell, John
Millenson, Roy
Rauth, Marilyn
Resnick, Lauren
Schutz, Richard
Smith, Ron
Tirrell, John
Walker, Decker
Wirt, John

Thursday, 4:45-5:45
Opportunity for those who will not be returning...

Bailey, Steve
Cannon, Bill
Cardenas, Jose
Driscoll, Denis
Fortune, Rex
Green, Tom
McGough, Kris
McGraw, Onalee
McMurrin, Sterling
Salett, Stan
Weber, Lillian
Wolfe, Deborah

Friday, 9:00-10:30
Who can and should do what in curriculum development?

Almquist, Judy
Archibald, George
Brandt, Ron
Broudy, Harry
Burdin, Joel
Cuban, Larry
Dow, Peter
Egge, Don
Moyer, Ellen
Parsons, Judy
Quick, Sue
Randolph, Elizabeth
Resnick, Lauren
Robinson, Wade
Segura, Robert
Senesh, Lawrence
Shaver, James
Timpane, Mike
Schwartz, Edith
van Geel, Tyll
Walker, Decker
Woy, Jean
Wugalter, Harry

APPENDIX C

INDIVIDUAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO NIE

Mrs. Judy Almquist
3606 Tracy Court
Alexandria, Virginia 22310

NIE might serve a useful role in research together with the parents who have spent many years developing their own style and to which their tried and true methods could accomplish effective curriculum change more quickly, more accurately, more appropriately, and probably at far less cost to the taxpayers. The questions we have to answer here are what are our educational goals for our children and who is responsible for that education. The parents' answer is that it is the educator's primary responsibility to prepare our children in the areas of math, reading, spelling, writing, etc. We feel that there is no time, no room, and really no need for some of the programs of the so-called career-curriculum innovators. Any social changes required in our children should come out of the natural maturation process. In other words, we don't want our children programmed for social change in our schools, with our money. You might say that the philosophy should come out of the curriculum, not the other way around. For decades parents have sent their children to school fairly secure in their feelings that Johnny and Mary were getting a sound, basic education in school and that the constant reinforcement of fundamentals of honesty and integrity were being emphasized. Not any more; and we just want you to know that we are awake, that flags are up, the red lights are on — we want to be included, we think we should be included at the very beginning of any curriculum development program.

Mr. Donald Barr
Headmaster
Hackley School
Benedict Avenue
Tarrytown, New York 10591

1. Government used to spend money to induce and assist university subject-matter experts to do things at the elementary and secondary levels. As far as writing texts and designing materials are concerned, that may no longer be necessary. In fact, if a man won't do it on his own, he may be the wrong one to do it.

2. I wonder whether we can (or should) do in subjects like human behavior--and therefore, human conduct--what was done in subjects like chemistry and math.

3. Mr. Archibald points out that you cannot take Federal money for your activities and still remain above the political battle. MACOS <u>cannot</u> be treated better than the B-1. We make even pacifists

pay taxes which are spent on military defense; but we do not spend pacifists' tax money in compelling pacifists' children to hear pacifism derided or undermined or even compassionately condescended to.

4. A pluralistic society is not a collection of pluralistic people, but a collection of different singularistic people--some of them fanatics, fanatics with rights. The test of any public program in a pluralistic society is whether it can be safeguarded from becoming an instrument by which one group of people who believe they possess the truth oppresses another group who believe they possess the truth. That is why books and materials that promulgate cultural relativism do not serve pluralism but make it acrimonious and thus less possible.

5. I favor indigenous educational improvement. The term "site-specific" is potentially ambiguous. It can mean that experts come in and design programs for a specific site, or else it can mean that the working stiffs on the site hold the initiative--not just the power to buy or refuse. NIE should go for indigenous initiative.

State Senator Clarence Blount
3600 Hillsdale Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21207

I believe the NIE should develop curriculum because they have the resources to do so. Many states do not have these resources although need for the development of curriculum may be recognized. The NIE should not only be tied with developing curricula but should help in the implementation of the curricula it develops. I recommend that the NIE in each area of curriculum activities establish institutes for the education and training of teachers for the final implementation of curriculum. I also suggest the establishment and operation of educational institutes for students. Similarly, institutes should be established for all levels of professional educators, administrators, and citizen groups. All these recommended institutes should encompass the complete spectrum of learning.

Dr. William Boyd
College of Education
The University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627

I believe that NIE should exercise caution and restraint in becoming involved in curriculum development. However, to the extent that NIE does decide to become involved I recommend 1) that NIE encourage diversity and pluralism in curriculum materials, and choice and diversity in the school program for all children; 2) that NIE encourage diverse, extensive, and meaningful participation in curriculum development

especially by parents and other lay persons, and to enable the first and second points, I recommend 3) that NIE encourage the enhancement and protection of local and lay control of education at the school site as well as the local school district level and discourage further centralization and professionalization of the control of education policy making.

Dr. Ronald Brandt
Associate Superintendent for Instruction
Lincoln Public Schools
P. O. Box 82889
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Curriculum materials are probably not the most important element in education. Most of the money spent in education goes for salaries and for general upkeep of schools.

Nevertheless, it is important that teachers have access to high-quality materials: plans, books, and other materials prepared by creative, qualified people and carefully tested for their effectiveness in enabling children to learn.

As curriculum administrator of a local school district, I feel there is--and will be--continuing need for large-scale (generic) curriculum development of the sort which most school districts lack resources to do. (It also seems that most publishers cannot afford the necessary investment either--but ways have already been established for publishers to play an appropriate role in the process.) NIE has the resources and capability to do some of it.

If particular philosophies of education have been over-represented--or if evaluation procedures have not been completely adequate, that can be improved. But there is a great difference between <u>improving</u> a promising movement and <u>destroying</u> it.

It is evident that not all parents think alike, and that either we must reduce everything to the lowest common denominator, or that schools must change to reflect our growing awareness of diversity and our growing commitment to pluralism. If so, NIE should find ways to build in choices at the level at which options really count; at the point where teachers and parents decide what is best for a particular pupil.

(I am also persuaded by Harry Broudy's argument that the diversity of our society calls for <u>some</u> curriculum intended to keep us talking to one another and learning to live with one another.)

Dr. Harry S. Broudy
406 Sunnycrest Court
Urbana, Illinois 61801

In a fragmented pluralistic society it is to be expected that the demand for options will increase and that the public school will be urged to respond by developing as many as possible.

The multiplication of options is well underway and can be worked out further by the political process. With the educational resources already in hand it is possible to satisfy a wide variety of real or imagined needs, and it remains only to find the financial resources to realize them.

It is appropriate, therefore, that NIE now give some support to searching for principles of unifying diversity and developing various curricula to implement them. The continuing redefinition of the educational requirements for enlightened citizenship in the coming decades, for example, would be a research/developmental enterprise worthy of a national institute. The ways in which knowledge is or is not used in deliberation on societal problems are today largely matters of conjecture. Research might enable us to devise curricula on more realistic understanding of the actual uses of schooling in non-school settings.

Dr. Gordon Brown, Director
Policy Analysis and Planning
Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

I don't know if the National Council will, in fact, come up with a policy on curriculum development, but if it does I would suggest that it consider the following issues:

1. The states have the primary responsibility for educational setting, finance, supervision, and implementation of the curriculum.

2. The Federal stimulation of innovation generally, and of vocational education in particular, has worked effectively, but most of the funds are subcontracted by states according to carefully designed plans.

3. The single option curricula or single models fail to provide the range of alternatives needed in different states in school districts.

4. That the Federal government should stimulate efforts to define education in other than school settings.

5. That curriculum research should focus on difficult problems of learning and teaching more so than other normal or general clientele.

I would additionally offer three possible areas of policy that the NIE and the NCER might consider:

1. In terms of methodology research, the focus should be on methodology research with applicability to generally diverse and generally identifiable teaching and learning situations.

2. That in terms of content research, the focus should be on high interest, high cost, and categorically identifiable curriculum content needs.

3. One that I've not heard mentioned much in this conference and that I think some research efforts ought to be put into is the future's research regarding the forecasting of pending national trends that will impact on curriculum regardless of the educational system.

Dr. Joel Burdin
Associate Director
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Suite 610
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036

The basic NIE policy should be one of diversification of efforts to create curriculum options continuously reflective of democracy's emerging goals and objectives. There should not be a "party line" on the best ways to educate children, youth, and adults (provided that occasionally the Congress, as the nation's "board of education", may assign NIE a specific thrust). Advisory counsels are needed in all phases of NIE activities.

Professional and lay organizations should be the major means of undertaking curriculum development projects. They have built-in access to the best thinking and experimenting, credibility, means of promoting study, and experimentation, and interactive delivery, cost-effective systems. Professional associations, responsive to the constituencies, are under regular pressure to be relevant and productive. Collaboration with legally-constituted collegiate, federal, state, and local education agencies is the normal mode of operation.

Education profession development should be a primary focus of all NIE curriculum efforts--second to none and integral in all. Pre- and in-service efforts are indispensable in all successful curriculum projects.

Education futurism should be a component of all efforts, for the future in the emerging world of the students, It can counteract tendencies toward instant obsolescence and promote relevance and vitality. These

policies would do much to minimize all too common tendencies in curriculum--to flit first, then flounder.

Dr. Francis S. Chase
Senior Consultant
Dallas Independent School District
School Administration Building
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

I. The objects of Federal policy for curriculum development should be to encourage and support such activities as:

   1. Continuing critical examination and creative reconstruction of the quality, adequacy, and availability of experience to develop the capabilities and social motivations of children, youth, and adults;

   2. Public understanding, debate, and participation in curriculum decisions;

   3. The advancement and utilization of knowledge of how learning occurs and the conditions which facilitate and retard learning.

II. In order to achieve these objectives, Federal agencies should seek the widest possible participation in expressing and developing ideas of:

   1. Those actively engaged in teaching and learning;

   2. The scholars in every branch of knowledge;

   3. The research and development agencies in education and related fields;

   4. Those engaged in government, business, health, social services; and,

   5. Minority groups and others whose wishes are often overlooked.

III. The National Institute of Education, in consideration of its modest budget and in the interest of optimum use of resources, should concentrate on promoting curriculum development and renewal through:

   1. Supporting well conceived and competently staffed curriculum development programs of state and local school systems, universities, and research and development organizations;

2. Stimulating and supporting research on key factors in (a)program design and development, (b) program implementation, (c) program evaluation, refinement, and renewal;

3. Direct and indirect contributions to curriculum design and development in neglected areas, or in support of rights;

4. Supporting the design and development of systems for (a) instructional management, (b) integration of school and out-of-school experience; (c) helping homes, businesses and other places of work, civic agencies and organizations to improve the quality of educative experiences;

5. Monitoring progress in meeting identified needs.

NIE should:

1. Reduce reliance on RFPs;

2. Keep a continuing record of work in progress, effects identified, etc.;

3. Respond to initiatives from organizations with established curriculum development capabilities;

4. Fund proposals from scholars with potential contributions to curriculum development;

5. Monitor progress in meeting identified needs.

Glossary

Curriculum: The experiences designed by society to promote the development and constructive use in the public interest of the talents and capabilities of all its people.

Curriculum Development: Systematic examination of the experiences provided and the effects produced (on individuals and the body politic) as a basis for continuing revitalization of the experiences.

Federal Policy: The manifest influences of Federal legislation and the actions of Federal agencies on the decisions and behaviors of governmental and corporate bodies, institutions, and citizens.

Dr. Jesse Coles
Deputy Superintendent for Administration and Planning
South Carolina State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

I'm speaking from a state education agency perspective. In the two days, I've come to two conclusions. First, from a state standpoint, we will have little access to the kind of resources to do the curriculum development I've heard described here. Not so much for lack of financial resources, but the lack of human resources. I can't see us attacking the geometry problem that Bob Davis mentioned and yet I think we need access to that kind of information. Secondly, I've come to the conclusion that it is unrealistic to expect the publishers and the media people to invest private capital to develop the kind of products that we are going to need because it is such a high risk for them. So, I think there are appropriate roles for NIE and the federal government in the arena of Research and Development in Curriculum.

Three very brief statements. An overriding item throughout the conference has been the power of the federal government and the concern about the abuse of it. I don't think any consideration has been given to the fact that since it has that power, that there is a responsibility to address the needs we have, to protect us from the flim-flam that could be developed as an alternative. Secondly, there was a discussion yesterday of national goals for education. If we can make the distinction between national and nationwide goals, NIE could serve as a catalytic agent in the effort to identify nationwide goals based on consensus. Finally, I would propose that NIE consider a procedure before the RFP's are developed of requiring some sort of impact statement; impact on students, impact on teachers, and perhaps impact on community which would allow the decision makers and the policy makers the opportunity to thoughtfully consider these factors before authorizing research and development in a specific area.

Dr. Larry Cuban
Superintendent of Schools
Arlington Public Schools
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22201

NIE should be most cautious in doing anything in curriculum, especially if it's viewed, overtly and covertly, as a major strategy of change. There are severe limits to Federal initiatives and change efforts. It this is indeed the main thrust, I would urge that NIE do nothing. If NIE does anything in curriculum, it should focus in gaining knowledge of what happens in classrooms and schools between teachers, materials, and kids. It should stimulate teacher involvement in curriculum-making at the school level. Where deficiencies in student performance are identified and where evidence exists that show some cause/effect relationship between curriculum and student performance and no efforts have been undertaken to deal with that deficiency, then and only then should NIE get involved in curriculum development--and

in doing so, through efforts that focus heavily on teachers.

Dr. Joseph Dasbach
American Association for Advancement of Science
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

I have interests, but I don't wear a vest. One possible role for NIE is to put people in touch with ideas and information that are distant from them, that is, make ideas and information more accessible than at present. Specifically, certain perspectives about the enterprise called curriculum development need to be made more accessible--perspectives about the size of our curriculum development efforts in the past and perspectives about the nature of the process of curriculum development. By way of example, the other day we were told that for the past fifteen years the National Science Foundation has spent about one hundred and seventeen million dollars for course content improvement. If you divide this by two hundred million people in the United States, this is about fifty cents per person for fifteen years. With respect to the nature of curriculum development, two aspects are often unmentioned. First developing a curriculum or portion thereof is an exploratory venture. A project which does not work may not be a failure. Risk is involved. Second, developing a curriculum is a means for communication among the diverse participants who often do not otherwise talk to each other.

Dr. Robert Davis
1210 West Springfield Avenue
Urbana, Illinois 61801

I want to disagree with the people who argue that there is no need for NIE to do curriculum development work--for two reasons: one, the nitty-gritty job of developing better material for study has to be done and has to be done by somebody. It faces the obstacle that very few people have the time and knowledge and adequate experience of working with children to develop, say, a new course in geometry. I keep using that as an example, but only as an example. We could make thousands of similar examples. There are at least three possible versions of geometry: one developed two thousand years ago by Euclid which is taught in the United States and no other developed nation in the world; one developed three hundred years ago by Descartes which is the one you learned in college, but not in high school; and another developed here in the United States by Willard Gibbs about a hundred years ago, which again is taught in universities. The question of whether those others should be taught in high school in the United States as they are in other countries needs to be faced. And there are very few people who are competent to undertake that who know enough about kids. If you ask a teacher, "could you teach this to your children?", she doesn't know because she hasn't done it. Second, commercial development for profit of those materials is not a realistic possibility--they will not make money. You can't protect them by copyright--you copyright your edition, but somebody can come in with a second or third book who

will surely make the money because they can learn from the previous ones. So when you are asking somebody to open a new field like this you are not telling him to do it for profit--he could not possibly--he has to do it from some other reason and with some other source of funding.

Mrs. Migdalia Romero de Ortiz
4 Robert Court
Spring Valley, New York 10977

As is evident from this conference, the American population is as diverse as the numbers who populate it. I don't see how we can move back to a homogeneous population where educational decisions and the course education takes is superimposed on all in an effort to homogenize and assimilate. I would like, therefore, to go on record as recommending that NIE consider in its master plan addressing itself to another viable option in education--one which I fear will soon disappear unless its exclusive association with remediation is somehow alleviated. All options must be available to all people and the option of enriching our linguistic repertoire by studying a language and studying through a language other than English--especially at an age when research has shown that language learning is most effective--that option and opportunity must be afforded all. The support of research and curriculum development in Bilingual Education by NIE, I feel, will do much to take it out of a "deficiency-remediation for some" syndrome and place it into an opportunity of "enrichment-for-all" syndrome.

Dr. Carl Dolce
Dean, School of Education
North Carolina State University
P. O. Box 5096
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

I'd like to indicate my feeling that all talk about alternatives given scarce resources and a variety of alternatives to please all aspects of American society is really an illusion. The Federal government will never be able to fund all of the alternatives to meet the pluralistic nature of this society. My recommendation basically to NIE is that it stay out of the business of curriculum development; that if it finds that it must go into that area, it outlines in advance the process and criteria by which it will undertake this, that the burden for proof or movement in any curriculum development project be borne by NIE and not by the opponents. It's my feeling that the legitimate role of NIE is to undertake those areas where vested interests won't undertake those areas. For example, basic research in education is needed and doesn't meet the vested interests of any part of society; its terribly expensive. On the other hand, curriculum

development does meet certain vested interests, and is not a legitimate role of NIE or any other aspect of the Federal government in my judgement.

Dr. Donald E. Egge
Associate Superintendent
Instruction Division
State Department of Education
942 Lancaster Drive, N. E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

The local school and the individual teacher establish the final stage of curriculum development. All other development is preliminary and should be seen in a supporting role. Diversity will always exist in Research and Development. What is now needed is systematic focus on sharing what works and how it can be assimilated to improve effectiveness. Below are three components of the system and a recommended role for NIE.

A. Local decision making includes the identification of local needs and problems, the decision to buy, make or adopt programs based on needs and problems, and the actual adaptation, adoption and implementation using available resources.

Recommended NIE Emphasis.

1. Clarify roles and decisions of various levels of governance and involvement.

2. Develop parent mechanisms for involvement.

3. Design mechanisms for LEA problem solving in curriculum development and implementation.

4. Search out more useful indications of effectiveness.

5. Develop effective teacher mechanism for access to the knowledge resource.

6. Increase the knowledge base and clarify mechanisms for cost-benefit analysis at local school and classroom levels.

7. Find more effective delivery systems to help teachers find time and to be more effective.

8. Find ways to infuse new content and emphases into existing program areas.

9. Develop mechanisms for learner branching through the curriculum experience depending on unique needs, interests and values.

B. Linkage to the knowledge base is generally provided by intermediate and state agencies, publisher representatives, R & D centers and teacher training institutions. Linkage joins the local school staff and information resources through technical assistance, training, and publication.

Recommended NIE Emphasis

1. Build capacities of LEA's, SEA's and others to be effective linkers and users.

C. Provide and maintain information resources

Knowledge producers and developers include local, state, and federal agencies, institutions, and organizations. They can relate their agendas to areas of greatest need.

Recommended NIE Emphasis.

1. Provide a structure and mechanisms for identifying gaps and duplications.

2. Disseminate and support dissemination of available information about needs and developments.

3. Provide development incentives.

Several NIE functions are suggested for implementation of these proposals.

A. Establish a conceptual and systemic framework for the instructional program setting in which curriculum plays a vital role in program development.

B. Identify and encourage a nationwide information resource base.

C. Coordinate a nationwide network for development and dissemination.

D. Provide incentives for research, development, and dissemination in the areas of greatest need.

E. Evaluate conditions and effects.

F. Encourage cooperation of local, state and national organizations in the formation of a national policy. Do not limit that policy to the formal federal role.

Dr. James D. Gates
Executive Director
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
1906 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

We recommend that a diverse variety of new curricular organizations, instructional materials, and courses be developed in the following areas:

1. the use of computers and hand-held calculators

2. applications and modeling

3. statistics and the general ability to collect, organize, interpret, and understand quantitative information

4. the metric system of measurement

5. problem solving, logical reasoning, and critical thinking

6. geometry--its role in the mathematics curriculum and its relationship to the total program

7. remedial instruction

8. teacher education programs--both preservice and in-service.

We recommend that the NIE establish one or more centers for longitudinal research. For example, an immediate, concerted effort on the part of experienced curriculum developers and researchers is needed to study the effects of various uses of hand-held calculators on the learning of concepts and skills of the elementary and secondary school mathematics curriculum.

We urge that those who will be expected to teach new programs be actively involved in the planning and development of the instructional materials and courses. We believe that teaching students good mathematics and relevant applications is a central role of the schools and the classroom teacher is the key to success in this endeavor.

Ms. Judy Herman
120 10th Street, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

I think NIE should disseminate information about curriculum development if it is not already available. With such information NIE should include interpretation of the data, drawing parallels, finding connections, and recognizing implications. This can be done in language that lay people as well as experts understand. NIE should also encourage research and evaluation of existing curriculum. Evaluation should include evidence of existing curriculum impact on classrooms. research should be done in areas of deficiencies.

Diversity is important and I think alternative approaches to curriculum development should be encouraged. The alternatives should include locally developed curriculum. Historic sites, museums, zoos, and other local institutions are potential academic environments, and their resources should be explored further. This can be done by encouraging effective working relationships between school and non-school institutions.

I think all curriculum should be evaluated and that this evaluation process should include parents and teachers. Finally, teachers should not be excluded from any facet of curriculum development and evaluation.

Dr. Paul Hurd
549 Hilbar Lane
Palo Alto, California 94303

1. The support of long-term (5-10 years) studies of student learning; curriculum impact; diffusion processes within schools of new practices; etc., (longitudinal studies).

2. The support of a series of studies, as to effective means for in-service education of teachers. Included in this category would be studies of communication strategies, management product materials, and school organization.

3. The support of studies and reports on crisis, and controversial issues in education and on innovative practices. The nature of studies to be along the line of a "consumer report" for parents and teachers.

4. The support of studies on national needs that may be relevant to education in general and curriculum development in particular. The NIE function may be one of coordinating, synthesizing, and interpreting studies already taking place in other agencies of the government.

5. The study of ways NIE may be of help in developing "site-specific" curriculum materials.

6. The support of complex studies on the "ecology" of the classroom and its impact on learning.

Mrs. Ann Kahn
Secretary, National PTA
9202 Porce Place
Fairfax, VA 22030

From a parent's point of view, I'd like first for NIE to realize that there is a great diversity among parents as there obviously is among academicians. (And I think that the kind of research that is funded has to include some sort of response to those differences.) Someone said to me I'm not monolithic and indeed parents are not "monolithic." There are a great number of different views and the kind of research that NIE is funding ought to request an understanding of that. I don't think that NIE should be aiming its research for the development of a national curriculum; I think that it would be much better to be able to support research which again reflects that diversity and the diverse kinds of means that there are in the local community, among those in the profession and among those whose children are in the schools. I ask third that NIE not really aim for, I guess what would be called, safe research.

Dr. Herbert Kliebard
University of Wisconsin
Box 25
Education Building
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

I would like to endorse what Jim Shaver has said first of all. That is, that whatever money is made available whether it be for curriculum development or for research and I'm not sure if I had a choice at this point I could choose between them, that it be made available in small packages for various efficiency reasons, but also I should think because when it is distributed in that form it would be consistent with what I perceive to be one of the themes of this conference - diversity and pluralism. Secondly, one position that I have endorsed for a long time and would continue to endorse is that considered attention be given to the curriculum as a whole - in conjunction with curriculum development within individual subject areas. Third, I would enter one caveat - the temptation at the national level is to consider curriculum development in terms of the direct national interest. Without going into the reasons, I think historically this has had a corrupting influence on the process of education itself. Education could be strictly considered in its own right as a public good rather than something instrumental to a particular urgent national problem.

Representative Joyce Lewis
Maine State Legislature
Maple Hill
Auburn, Maine 04210

It would appear to me that education in the U.S. could best be served by strengthening the places where teachers train before they become teachers--the universities, the teacher training colleges, and the liberal arts colleges--these places are not innovative. As one member of this conference (Dr. Senesh) described them--they are a hot bed of cold feet! They need to be made aware of new techniques in teaching, of new subject matter and of where the job market is for their graduates; whether it be in some non-traditional plan of education or whether the institutions should indeed be encouraging so many students to go into the field of education. NIE could be invaluable to them and this is something that could best be done on the national level.

No national curriculum.

Dr. John C. Maxwell
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Road
Urbana, Illinois 61801

I am a little disappointed that the NIE contemplates extensive work in development of "curriculum." I have long hoped that it would focus on research, which would enlighten curriculum development and find sophisticated and relatively incontrovertible evidence on nagging gaps in our knowledge. For example, and only for example, what are the necessary conditions under which <u>all</u> children and youth can become highly articulate in spoken and written discourse? The assumption of English language arts teachers is that smaller class size is the answer. Class size is only one of several relevant variables. Hard answers to this question (these questions) have enormous significance to practice and to the society. Because accretion of mastery in writing takes years, research must follow kids for years. It will be slow and expensive, and everybody involved should know it.

Let curriculum materials development be done by those who are skilled in doing it--most notably commercial publishers--and if they lack skill give them assistance in acquiring it. See James Squire's paper for wisdom on this topic.

Dr. James A. Mecklenberger
National School Boards Association
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20007

If there is one recommendation, it is pay attention to school boards. That's something which the Federal Government rarely does-or too rarely does. There are a number of reasons why you ought to and a number of ways in which you might. The reasons are simple. They are the legitimate, formal public agents in the public schools. They are, in fact, local decision makers and more important, like it or not, school boards make many decisions which sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly affect curriculum options. Maybe there will be options of what the given curriculum will or will not emphasize , whether a given experiment will or will not be carried out in the public school systems--in many ways those who try to develop curriculum cannot, though they have often tried to, avoid the school boards. School boards feel, and I think with some justice, that the Federal Government sometimes by intent, sometimes benignly, is leading the nation away from localism in public schools. Clearly, school boards believe in localism in public schools, and while that's an issue that we can't resolve here today, as a representative of the Association, and personally, I think localism is our great strength, and as NIE considers curriculum development, it ought to seriously consider by whatever model, that much or all of what it does is local in design rather than national, as some of the big curriculum projects are. A final comment, picking up on Donald Barr's side earlier: consensus, by the nature of the beast, often means predomination of professionals. School boards have a healthy disdain themselves for professionals and that frequently gets returned -- professionals then frequently find it difficult or impossible to deal with the board.

Mr. Roy Millenson
Association of American Publishers
1701 L Street
Washington, D. C. 20036

My first recommendation deals with what is occurring in Congress next year. The supplemental appropriation bill will be up early next year for the current appropriation for NIE and other agencies which weren't in the Labor--HEW Appropriations. NIE is one of the few educational activities which is now funded at less than the recommendations of the Ford budget. Therefore, my suggestion to all present is to get in touch with your congressmen and senators to support full appropriation in the budget for NIE--we have all sorts of suggestions for NIE to undertake activities but this can't be done without money. Now, let's go on to some others.

1. Basic research should be done as to how children learn.

2. We should emphasize those areas which, as indicated the other day are required by law, especially those areas where the markets are thin--I specifically refer to not only the handicapped but also bilingual education. There are a number of thin markets there that cannot be developed without federal help. There aren't that many students and there aren't any programs already on the books.

3. I would urge that participation and especially comments on the suggestions here include hearing from those who make decisions on curriculum--for example in the adoption states, there would be those who are the book directors in the state, those who choose the textbooks, and the members of the textbook commission.

Finally, I would just invite your attention to a law which has been recently strengthened, Sec. 432 from the General Education Provisions Act, which says that the government cannot dictate curriculum nor can a person from the government use the laws to dictate curriculum or books to a local school district.

Mrs. Ellen Moyer
Maryland State Board of Education
35 Eastern Avenue
Annapolis, Maryland 21403

In my opinion the role of NIE in curriculum development should be primarily in research for enlightenment.

NIE should serve to (1) clarify issues, with all their diversity, as raised by the variety of public concerns, (2) examine, analyze the issues, (3) postulate the predictive consequences of certain avenues, keeping in mind governance systems and the needs of a free and diverse society, (4) disseminate information and findings [and indeed ask needed questions to stimulate our own spirit of inquiry] to the public and individuals in order to aid in decision making by those to whom state constitutions have granted the authority to make decisions about education.

Mrs. Judy Parsons
Parents Committee for Better Education in Northern Virginia
13821 Botts
Woodbridge, Virginia

Perhaps you will bear with me while I disagree with most of you. We feel as parents, speaking for parents, we wish the NIE were a voluntary organization which could be joined by people who seek its services. If it were in the area of school site services, they could

avail themselves of these services at whatever the price might be. But since it is not voluntary and since our tax dollars are demanded, I would request that NIE make its involvement in education as minimal as possible. We feel also that compulsory education should not attempt to include the total spectrum of learning. Nor should the educator ever feel that he should decide what should be included in a child's experience. This should be left to the parents who have created him. Parent input we feel is very important and should not be a token effort, but rather a viable source of input. Parents should not be singled out as an unprofessional source or the child producer, but rather the actual director, again, of the child's experience. We feel that as far as NIE becoming involved directly in curriculum development that this should be left to the private sector and to the local municipalities.

Mrs. Elizabeth S. Randolph
Assistant Superintendent, Zone II
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
P. O. Box 149
Charlotte, North Carolina 28230

It has been suggested in some of the papers and in the discussion at this conference that classroom teachers in their local settings have needs which are not always addressed by national curriculum designs.

It has been suggested that classroom teachers need to understand how children learn. They need help in determining the learning styles of children and in planning teaching strategies accordingly.

Local school districts have little or no funding for research to improve curriculum and teaching based on local needs.

As a local school administrator I recommend that NIE direct its efforts toward the support of projects to help local school districts develop their own research capabilities in curriculum development and in-service training.

Dr. Lauren Resnick
The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavorial Sciences
202 Junipero Serra
Stanford, California 94305

Curriculum development is a major, if not the major, link between knowledge and practice in education. Therefore, NIE should work with all appropriate groups--parents, teachers, school boards, professional curriculum developers, etc. But whatever the curriculum group and whatever their specific agenda, NIE ought to make sure that contact with relevant scholarship in teaching, learning, and in the chosen subject matter be maintained. Otherwise, NIE will be failing in one of its basic missions which is to build a knowledge base for educational practice.

Dr. Richard Schutz
Executive Director
SWRL Educational Research and Development
4665 Lampson Avenue
Los Alamitos, California 90702

There are three points that I would like to make. We feel that much is known in the area of learning and instruction. We feel that much more needs to be known in this area. Secondly, we feel that development is a distinctively different enterprise from research, and it has a much more recent history as an intellectual enterprise. We have found that development can contribute to research and vice versa. We feel that more attention should be given to this relationship. Third, we feel that the new enterprise for American education in the area of curriculum concerns implementation, the demonstrated use of research and development in the schools. We feel that there are great opportunities to do this within the next five years.

Dr. Robert Segura
College of Teacher Education
Sacramento State University
Sacramento, California 95819

1. That NIE adopt a policy to improve curriculum in the area of Basic Skills.

2. That NIE adopt a policy which would establish a research and development center designed to improve academic achievement of culturally and linguistically different children.

3. That NIE adopt a policy to examine existing curriculum practices and make recommendations regarding what types of curriculum materials should be removed from schools in order to relieve the pressure of an overly fac curriculum which attempts to address anything and everything to everybody.

4. That NIE adopt a policy which would allow schools to examine and prioritize their curriculum needs with input from the community.

Mrs. Nelle H. Taylor
107 Neal Street
Saluda, South Carolina 29138

1. Plea for recognition of the teacher as a decision maker. I ask the NIE to look carefully at the unique role which only the teacher has in curriculum development and its implementation.

2. NIE might coordinate the diverse parent interests and work toward development of parent education groups. As opposed to parent advocacy, we, as teachers, encounter parent apathy.

3. Consideration of funding in-service to assist in keeping up with trends in education.

4. Recommend that NIE gather data to consider the mammoth job being thrust upon the school today and the great disappointment concerning its falling short of the many goals and objectives being thrust upon it. These goals and objectives are not those of the teacher, child, and the parent--those closest to the process.

5. We believe in education for all children--bilingual, gifted, special needs--all kinds. Help needs to be extended to locals in this area.

6. Recognition of the kind of impact to be made by television, public broadcasting and educational television.

Dr. Michael Timpane
The Rand Corporation
2100 M Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20037

1. Impact of curriculum development vs. other activities--not clear.

   - don't know how to rank curriculum development vs. other NIE activities (i.e. research) devoted to the same goals.

   - politically risky, but a good way to stimulate discussion of value questions otherwise overlooked.

2. Substantive emphases stemming from notions of national interest.

   - quality of knowledge delivery--(only with strong hypotheses from the disciplines)

   - public goods and externalities (e.g. national security, economic development, voting behavior, world economic/political order.)

- non-majoritarian concerns (e.g. offsetting state-local majoritarian bias or other cases where no market exists).

3. Functional Emphases

- concentrate on development, mostly typological; not demonstration/ innovation; later non-aggressive dissemination.

- diversity--local choice, participation; building up a weak, unstable policy system.

- implementation processes--schools, networks of public and private interests.

Dr. J. Lloyd Trump
National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

NIE needs to recognize the importance of evaluation which was inadequately represented in this conference. I refer to the evaluation of pupil progress, curriculum development, and of the general program, and it should not be to compare one pupil with another or one program with another, but rather to produce better data, or the continued kind of diagnosis and prescriptive actions, much better than schools use now in determining programs in curriculum development. The curriculum now results more from prejudice than scientific procedure. An extremely important task is to make tentative, and constantly re-examine, decisions about how little, actually, everyone in our society really needs to know, to be able to do and to be, in the affective areas and the reason why that is important so if there is time for hobby and career exploration and development, and to go down blind alleys and find you're wrong and have time to recoup. The point is that to insure diversity in a school requires more structure and of a different nature than most schools now provide and NIE can help in analyzing and discovering what that structure really needs to be.

Mr. John A. Valentine
Professional Associate for Academic Affairs
College Entrance Examination Board
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019

It is clearest to me at this point that NIE would provide a useful service to all parties engaged in curriculum development by gathering and disseminating factual information, where lacking, on the actual status of curriculum patterns and teaching practices in American schools.

Dr. Decker F. Walker
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

NIE should launch a program of study and experimentation on the consideration of educational reforms. The purpose of this program should be to discover how the process of considering whether or not to undertake a given educational reform can be done more wisely in local schools, in state and federal agencies and in the private agencies where important decisions affecting the programs of American schools are made.

Recognizing that the consideration of educational reforms inevitably involves both substantive or technical concerns and political ones, the process needs to be

- more democratic, more open to participation of laymen, experts, and educators with a variety of views, values, and interest,
- more objective, based on more evidence critically weighed and interpreted in open debate,
- better targeted on serious long-term needs of students, communities, and the nation,
- more effectively linked to decision and action.

Dr. David L. Williams
Assistant Director, Science Teaching Center
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

I recommend that NIE consider as a component of curriculum development the necessity to study (to research) the need for a "balanced curriculum" for children. A curriculum that is devoted to the knowledge and skills that are considered important and valuable to an enlightened populace, e.g., achievement of a balance that would give serious consideration to science education in the processes of living and learning today and tomorrow.

With this is a need to provide planned education for parents to help them to better understand the nature of children, and how they learn, and how this nature of children and the curriculum are meshed for effectiveness. Regional pilot projects for this might be appropriate to provide input to determine the potential of this idea.

It is inferred that a parallel to the parent education concept is effective teacher education, at all levels, and adequate materials and facilities to support the education process of curriculum decision making.

Recommendations to NIE
Submitted in Letters and Memoranda
Subsequent to the November Conference

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Suite 101 • 1515 Wilson Boulevard • Arlington, Virginia 22209

1976

PRESIDENT
James P. Shaver
College of Education
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322

PRESIDENT-ELECT
Howard D. Mehlinger
Director, Social Studies
Development Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
47401

VICE-PRESIDENT
Anna S. Ochoa
College of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida
32306

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Todd Clark
Jean Tilford Claugus
Harris L. Dante
Paul Fleum
Albert J. George
Florence Jackson
Theodore Kaltsounis
Pauline Kouris
Charles Mitsakos
Jane Lowrie Mounts
Raymond Muessig
Jack P. Risher
Carl Stasio, *Ex Officio*

WASHINGTON OFFICE
NCSS, Suite 406
2030 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-6760

Executive Director
Brian J. Larkin

Administrative Assistant
Mary Crum

Council Development
Bill Hanna

Special Projects
Helen Roberts

Social Education, Editor
Daniel Roselle

Executive Secretary Emeritus
Merrill F. Hartshorn

ARLINGTON OFFICE
NCSS, Suite 101
1515 Wilson Blvd
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 527-4954

Business and Convention Coordinator
Carlyane Dunn

Membership Processing
Jeanne Grimmer

Office Support
Ellen N. Holway

Advertising and A/M Exhibits
Elizabeth Quigley

November 24, 1976

Dr. Jon Schaffarzick
Curriculum Development Task Force
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Jon:

I appreciated the opportunity to participate in NIE's Curriculum Development Conference in Washington, D.C. last week. It was important to have the National Council for the Social Studies represented at the Conference; and the Conference was also particularly relevant for me because my career has had dual curriculum development and research thrusts.

I wanted to follow up on my brief oral statement of recommendations during the Friday morning session. This written statement covers most of the items in the Guides for Public Discussion of NIE Curriculum Development Issues, although the numbers will not correspond. My recommendations are:

1. I urge that NIE define "curriculum" broadly as those experiences initiated and monitored by instructional leaders in hopes of accomplishing learning goals and objectives (including considerations of scope and sequence within subject areas as well as across subject areas; and including the experiences provided out of the classroom in the school as an institution and out of the school as planned instructional settings).

2. NIE should be involved in the development of new curricula. Included should be support for projects to provide thinking on priorities for curriculum development (including both the target populations of people and the schooling outcomes that merit attention), the stimulation of diverse thought about appropriate curricula, and the support of curriculum development projects in line with the priorities identified. A variety of curricula with potential national impact, but adaptable to local circumstances, should be sought. Parents, teachers, local supervisors, and university personnel

should be involved both in the definition of priorities and in curriculum development. And, the curriculum development process must include careful product evaluation.

It is relevant to note here that commercial publishers cannot be counted on to provide the necessary curricula. In the first place, commercial publishers are not curriculum developers in large part, but materials developers and publishers of materials developed by other people. The very nature of the commercial enterprise limits both the innovativeness of commercial publishers and their ability to address the needs of small groups and non-textbook instructional needs.

Also, I believe it imperative that special attention be devoted to curriculum development priorities in the area of citizenship education. Certainly, in a democratic society the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors necessary for effective citizenship participation must be considered to be basic skills; but major curriculum development and research attention is not being directed toward them.

3. NIE should avoid the funding of large, exclusive curriculum development projects and instead use the USOE Cooperative Research Project model of a variety of relatively small (e.g., perhaps less than $100,000 per year), field initiated projects, with project directors actually serving as principal investigators from the inception of the proposal to the final report to the agency, and including the intimate involvement of teachers and lay people. By "large, exclusive" projects, I am referring to those funded by NSF on a multi-million dollar scale, such as MACOS. Such large scale funding encourages the growth of curriculum development entrepreneurs who are likely to lose sight of priorities in their quest for funds to keep their organizations operating. They also lead to unnecessarily large investments in overly polished media and in personnel costs for overqualified and underthoughtful academicians, as well as operating against the development of curricular variety in the long run.

4. NIE should support the careful consideration of new alternatives for disseminating the results of curriculum development projects. To date, commercial publishers, the ERIC system, and the USOE-funded dissemination papers for special target groups have not surmounted the obstacles to impacting actual classroom practice--especially with curricula that call for innovative subject matter or methods, or that are addressed to relatively small target populations.

5. Research should be intimately tied to curriculum development, in that careful "product validation", "summative evaluation", or "learner verification" should be built into each curriculum project. Also, funds should be provided to do extensive summative evaluations of "completed" competing curricular products.

6. NIE should support research to provide the knowledge base for curriculum development, as well as an essential part of curriculum development. Research incorporated into curriculum development should be aimed not only at providing evaluation evidence but at providing further basic information about the learning-teaching process--including areas in which we now generally lack systematic knowledge, such as interactions among student learning styles (including both personality and cognitive variables), teaching styles and curriculum strategies, and various dimensions of curriculum organization and context.

The order in which I have discussed curriculum development and research may imply that I would place a higher priority on curriculum development than on research. However, I believe that the greatest need is for basic research to provide a better basis for curriculum development; but, at the same time, curriculum development should not be ignored.

In addition, NIE should support work to develop new assessment techniques and new research strategies for curriculum validation and basic research.

7. If validation and basic research are to be adequately accomplished, NIE must support the training of additional researchers. Such support should be based on a careful appraisal of existing and potential gaps in research personnel, including consideration of curricular areas and research skill areas.

8. Above all, there needs to be a drastic expansion of funds available for both basic research and curriculum development. I strongly urge that the National Council for Educational Research take a strong advocacy role in impacting federal government priorities, so that more dollars will be allocated to NIE to be used for both curriculum development and research.

Dr. Jon Schaffarzick
November 24, 1976
Page Four

I hope that these recommendations will be of use as you assist the NCER in developing its policy recommendations.

Sincerely,

Jim Shaver

James P. Shaver
President
National Council for the Social Studies

JPS/kw

cc: Brian Larkin

P.S. As I mentioned to you, Jon, it would be very helpful to have a list of conference participants with affiliations (such as the National Council for the Social Studies and the National Parent Teachers Association) included.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

Intramural Correspondence

College of Education

FROM: Tyll van Geel

DATE: November 22, 1976

TO: Jon Schaffarzick, Chairman
N.I.E. Curriculum Development Task Force

SUBJECT: Recommendation to N.I.E. Curriculum Development Task Force*

Copies to:

If the time comes that N.I.E. does decide to support some kind of curriculum development or implementation effort, it will have entered upon a new round of highly political decisions. At the same time those decisions will not be directly accountable to the public. The courts will not review those decisions and Congress has provided few guidelines to guide your work. In light of these facts the procedures you adopt should be as fair as possible and should make you as accountable as possible. Thus, I recommend that:

1. Before policy is formulated and implemented by N.I.E. that it continue to hold public hearings and conferences to obtain as wide a range of opinion as possible as to both what the issues are and as to what N.I.E. should be doing.

2. Before grants are made that a written statement of N.I.E. policy and standards for the handing out those grants be publicly issued.

3. Before major curriculum development and/or implementation grants are distributed that a public hearing be held at which time the major competitors for the grant are given an opportunity to present their views; and be subject to questioning. Those other parties also interested in grants should also be given an opportunity to present their views.

4. Once an applicant has been selected, N.I.E. should issue a written statement announcing its choice and the reasons therefore in light of the standards publicly and previously announced for selection of a grantee.

*This statement is not worded exactly as read at the conference on November 19, 1976, but the substance is the same.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
810 LINCOLN TOWER • 1860 LINCOLN ST. • DENVER, COLORADO 80295 • 303/861-0911

WESLEY APKER
Executive Secretary

GARY ASHLEY
Deputy Executive Secretary

OFFICERS
President
Grant L. Anderson
1080 Daniels Drive
Tacoma, Washington 98466

Past President
James M. Connor
P.O. Box 544
Kingstree, South Carolina 29556

President-Elect
Louis R. Smerling
2552 W. Lake of the Isles
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405

Vice-President
Adrienne Y. Bailey
2961 S.M.L. King Dr., Apt. 911
Chicago, Illinois 60616

Secretary-Treasurer
Emryn I. Griffith
225 North Washington Street
Rome, New York 13440

DIRECTORS AT LARGE

Rosemary K. Clarke
2544 Casey Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Henry E. Pogue
P.O. Box 148
Ft. Thomas, Kentucky 41075

Catherine V.A. Smith
55 Woodlawn Street
Hamden, Connecticut 06517

AREA VICE PRESIDENTS

Northeast
Ruth Mancuso
411 Swarthmore Road
Glassboro, New Jersey 08028

Central
John E. van der Linden
Box 181
Sibley, Iowa 51249

Southern
Elizabeth G. Heim
311 Fairmont Avenue
Winchester, Virginia 22601

Western
Reverend Siulagi Solomona
P.O. Box 1017
Leone, American Samoa 96799

November 29, 1976

Dr. Jon Schaffarzick, Director
NIE Curriculum Development Project
Department of Health, Education, & Welfare
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Jon:

In an effort to lend support to NIE's efforts in Curriculum Development NASBE submits the following official statement.

NASBE supports the NIE efforts in the area of curriculum research and development as long as the NIE project continuously gives regard to the fine line between targeting R and D funds and developing materials for marketing. While resources at the national level exceed state and local resources, the needs of the local and state level should drive the national effort.

NASBE gives specific support to the following kinds of NIE efforts in curriculum research and development:

(1) ongoing research including longitudinal study in curricular areas determined by current and predictable educational concerns, e.g., basic skills, education of the gifted, education of the handicapped, and so on;

(2) development of prototype materials based on relevant research which reflect options in presentation based upon the philosophical approach of the local school district or program alternative;

(3) development of prototype materials which focus on a much expanded teacher in service education component prior to local district implementation of the materials or approach;

(4) widespread dissemination of results of research and materials developed to allow state and local personnel the opportunity to choose those suitable to their needs.

I trust this is helpful.

Sincerely,

Wesley Apker
Executive Secretary

WA:mpw

cc: Grant L. Anderson
William Brown
Louis R. Smerling

College Entrance Examination Board
888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019
(212) 582-6210

lice of the President

December 1 1976

Mr. John Schaffarzick, Chairman
NIE Curriculum Development Task Force
National Institute of Education
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Mr. Schaffarzick:

While I was unable to schedule the November 17-19 conference on curriculum development, which I regret, John Valentine, as you know, represented the College Board and participated in the full schedule. John has subsequently briefed me, along with key officers of the Board, on the substance of the three-day meeting, along with a digest of the background papers. I have reviewed the papers, with appreciation.

This letter responds to your invitation to offer comment on the particular issue: What is the federal role in curriculum development for American schools, and what should be NIE's function in the curriculum development domain? (I trust I have caught your intended purposes reasonably accurately.)

The College Board is seriously interested in this issue and will do what it can to assist NIE in furthering its resolution. As you know, the Board has, for many years, served as the voluntary medium for articulating those components of school curriculums which relate particularly to school/college transition. While shunning a prescriptive role, the Board has systematically drawn together school and college teachers over the years to develop Achievement Tests (in fifteen subject areas) and Advanced Placement Examinations as well as Course Descriptions (in twenty subject areas), and these instruments have undoubtedly influenced school curriculums to some degree. Hence, indirectly, we are at least partially engaged in curriculum design on a national scale. (Other College Board instruments, such as the College-Level Examinations, the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test, and the Scholastic Aptitude Test, while less directly influential on school curriculum, are sometimes perceived as such.)

I offer these expressions of our interest and background to indicate a rich resource of data and skilled personnel available to your investigation. The singular feature of our work, distinguishing it perhaps from a "federal system," lies in the voluntary, associational nature of the College Board, the forums it provides, and the teachers and scholars it engages in producing and monitoring its examinations. Up to this time we have largely limited our work to the school/college transition. We are willing to extend

that scope to the secondary schools altogether, and have been urged by our membership to do so. This topic is being carefully weighed in our governance channels.

This brings me to the object of the letter, namely, how to counsel NIE in its timely and important task. In offering these suggestions, I draw upon the background papers furnished to participants, and upon the reported developments of the November 17-19 meeting:

1. We support the position that cautions against a nationally prescribed curriculum.

2. We comprehend and appreciate the wide diversity of educational systems, goals, and curriculum circumstances prevailing in America, and support that diversity, provided it is based upon informed and intended choices.

3. We urge NIE to invest resources in evaluating and disseminating good curriculums, K-12, acknowledging the diversity of their origins and applications.

4. We urge NIE to invest in the pre-service and in-service development of school faculties in the adoption of proven curriculums, lending their own local flavor to the identified courses of study.

5. We urge NIE to investigate and identify the probable discontinuities existing between secondary and postsecondary fields of subject matter and encourage the redress of such discontinuities. The range could include articulation from secondary schools to the diverse systems of postsecondary institutions.

6. We urge NIE to examine the alleged relaxation of common core subject matter expectations by the secondary school curriculum, and weigh the implications of fewer "required" courses, and increased options for "elective" courses.

7. We suggest that NIE and the Council devote some resources as seed money to LEA's and possibly SEA's to encourage curricular innovation and new designs.

In all of the foregoing themes for inquiry, the College Board has competence and experience. We would welcome an opportunity to pursue with NIE any of the above suggestions, or to receive further counsel from NIE as to how we can be helpful.

Sincerely,

S. P. Marland, Jr.
President

cc: Mr. Harold L. Hodgkinson
Mr. John R. Valentine

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Jon Schaffarzick

FROM: Peter Dow

SUBJECT: Reflections on NIE Curriculum Conference: Nov. 17-19, 1976

DATE: December 6, 1976

Your conference was both instructive and disturbing. It was superbly organized to provide you with a broad spectrum of opinion on the state of education in the United States, and you got it--every color in the rainbow. For three days you heard from every imaginable political constituency, and one was reminded once more that education and politics are inseparable. This is both the strength of our system and its weakness, for it makes innovation virtually impossible except at times of national crisis (e.g., the National Defense Education Act). Under these circumstances, it is hard to know how educational policy-making can rise above the level of mediocrity.

The problem is that innovation requires leadership and risk-taking. For a brief time following the launching of the Russian Sputnik, this was possible in American education because, like the mythical "missile gap," the public thought that American science and mathematics education lagged behind the Russians. Believing this, Congress was willing to invest unprecedented amounts in educational research and development. We dwell now on some of the more obvious blunders and condemn that effort without considering both the enormous gains that were brought off in a few short years and, more important, what might have been gained if the commitment to educational reform had been sustained. When Jerry Bruner went to England in the early 70s, British educators remarked to him about the massive waste represented by the American retreat from educational reform. We expect instant success, they pointed out, or we think we have failed. By contrast, they have been working on informal education for thirty years!

My plea to the NIE is that you cease trying to please everyone and pursue excellence wherever you can find it. Excellence in any field is a rare commodity, and it is particularly hard to find in education. It resides in the most unlikely places, and is as readily found in our humblest school systems as in our greatest universities. Your task is to find it and foster it, irrespective of political considerations and geographic boundary lines. If you compromise that goal in the interests of avoiding controversy or pleasing everyone, there is little likelihood that the NIE will contribute significantly to the improvement of American education.

What do I mean by "excellence"? Excellence in education is the ability to intervene in the natural patterns of the child's growth in such a way as to improve significantly the likelihood of successful learning. Excellent teaching can make a profound difference in a child's life--as anyone knows who has ever encountered it--yet, curiously, we attach little value to it. We do practically nothing to foster it, or even figure out what it is. Briefly, thanks in part to the Russian Sputnik and the enormous interest in educational research and development that it stimulated, we are beginning to know something about how children learn, and even a little bit about how adults can intervene in the growth process in ways that improve upon the child's natural tendencies. Furthermore, the educational reforms of the 1960s made visible a sizable number of excellent teachers whose instinctive knowledge about children's learning came together for the first time with the research and development community. This mix of lay and formal knowledge is a precious resource from which to draw for further improvements. I would urge you to look for those people and institutions that are struggling to advance the frontiers of teaching and learning theory, to support their work, and to see that the products of these efforts are widely distributed even though their commercial value may be limited at the present time.

One final point. It is fashionable now to think in terms of "cost effective" solutions to our educational problems and to seek the production of products that will quickly find their way into the profit-making sector of the educational marketplace. The problem with this approach is that innovation is almost never cost-effective in the short run. It involves a high degree of risk and a disproportionate degree of failure, and the costs are such that private industry cannot possibly sustain them. Some of the most important innovations, such as how to teach reading and writing more effectively, may require years of development before they can be successfully converted into marketable products. Thus, the only real hope for innovation in education is through government subsidy. Your task is to find the most significant innovations, and to back them generously irrespective of short-term commercial considerations.

dallas independent school district

Nolan Estes
General Superintendent

November 22, 1976

Dr. Gary Sykes
National Institute of Education
Department of Health, Education and
Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20208

Dear Gary:

It was my intention on my return from Washington to try to put in better order my ideas on Federal policy for curriculum development. I regret that the press of other matters has forced me to postpone further thinking about this matter.

I am taking the liberty of sending you a portion of remarks which I made at a NIE Conference in 1974, as I believe the three proposed strategies still have some merit.

I enjoyed seeing you at the Conference and I hope that the work which you and John Schaffarzick are doing will help to clarify NIE's role in curriculum development.

Sincerely yours,

Francis S. Chase
Senior Consultant

FSC/s

Enclosure

3700 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204, 214/824-1620

Many of the more serious roadblocks to the generation of knowledge for education and its fruitful application to practice can be cleared away only by continuing support for teams of competent researchers and developers who have freedom to select the problems on which they will work, to take risks and to learn from ventures that do not pay off as well as from those that do; and who are judged, not so much on the basis of short term products, as by the potential represented by their demonstrated capability and their approach to the solution of important problems.

If the foregoing assumptions are approximations to truth, it would seem advisable to supplement the strategies currently employed by the National Institute of Education by some or all of the following approaches:

1. A strategy of encouraging the production of knowledge potentially applicable to education by making support available to well designed proposals from person in universities, research institutes, R&D organizations in and outside of education, and persons in the operating systems. NIE has already indicated a commitment to this strategy, but it has not yet implemented it sufficiently to produce any marked results. My feeling is that a much greater effort must be made to search out those who are raising seminal questions and who have the capability to pursue these questions to fruitful ends. At the present time the research community perceives too many constraints attached to grants from NIE to justify the efforts necessary to obtain the meager funds likely to be available.

2. A strategy of broadening or supplementing the present program purchase policy by support on a continuing basis for institutes, centers and laboratories which are engaged in building highly specialized capabilities for the improvement of early childhood education, education for

careers, bilingual and bicultural education, or other areas which competent panels judge likely to make important contributions to the extension of *educational* opportunity or to the improvement of the quality of education. To do this NIE would have to place less dependence on RFP's and more dependence on its own efforts to identify promising work in progress.

3. A strategy of supporting the more promising efforts now underway to build linkages with operating systems and to involve personnel in operating agencies in need-identifying and problem-solving activities. Much can be learned from the relative success and the limitations of past and present attempts to involve state and local agencies in R and D or in other systematic approaches to identification of needs and the meeting of needs through social invention, technological ingenuity, and, otherwise.

In the foregoing analysis, explicit or implicit questions are raised with regard to certain proposed NIE policies or strategies. I shall now try to delineate more precisely, the nature of my concerns.

My first concern is that NIE may seriously endanger its continuing support and future potential by undertaking too wide a range of activities and by investing its scarce resources too heavily in undertakings from which the returns promise to be long delayed or uncertain. It seems to me that this young agency needs to temper its ambition with a realistic assessment of the requirements for building a sound base of political and professional support. This, I believe, can best be accomplished by devoting a major part of resources to the support of institutions and persons who have good track records in research, development, social invention, and the application of knowledge and technology to the improvement of education.

A second concern is the danger of instituting non-productive or counter-productive controls by the Federal bureaucracy. Symptoms of a tendency to overmanagement appear in several forms in the documents which I have been reviewing. Among these symptoms are the program purchase plan as it is now defined, the attempt to write narrow specifications into RFP's, the commitment of funds only through the pilot test stage for product development, and the numerous checks incorporated in the proposals for evaluation and delivery of development products. I recognize that the procedures to which I refer have been instituted in response to severe criticisms (including those by the General Accounting Office); and I am well aware that NIE is under obligation to take all reasonable measures to assure good returns on the resources committed to it.

A third concern is that the public and the Congress may be led to seek scapegoats for the comparatively small impact produced in the short run by R&D operations and NIE initiatives unless all of us help to increase understanding of the inadequacy of the resources committed to R&D. A strong case can be made for an investment in R&D of at least one per cent of operating costs; and this might be taken as a goal to be achieved within five years or less. If all educators would support this objective, while at the same time working to improve R and D effectiveness, the consequences for the improvement of education might become visible to all informed citizens.

To clarify my views further, I am appending to this paper, three passages from a position paper prepared two years ago for use in the Congressional hearings on the legislation to establish NIE.

--Excerpts from address by
Francis S. Chase for
meeting of NIE and CEDaR representatives
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1974

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
GOVERNOR'S CABINET
SANTA FE
87503

JERRY APODACA
GOVERNOR

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION

November 22, 1976

Jon Schaffarzick, Chairman
NIE Curriculum Development Task Force
National Institute of Education
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20208

Dear Dr. Schaffarzick:

I want to tell you how much I enjoyed the recent conference in Washington about NIE's position relative to curriculum.

This is the first meeting of this type that I have ever attended, and I must say it was rather interesting. The comments that were made often tended to disregard the papers which had been written and presented and dwelled on personal preferences or an elaboration of individual experiences. In the main, however, I felt that enough of the participants stayed on target and directed their comments toward the issues.

Since NIE is searching for input, and inasmuch as each participant was given a very brief period for an oral presentation, I thought it best to send a written statement containing other than my perceptions of the meeting. Perhaps this will be of more value to you. Therefore, what follows is my written input in response to your efforts to obtain ideas about what the NIE should consider in its list of priorities.

First of all, I don't believe the NIE should be in the business of developing curriculum. As Dr. Broudy stated so well, the body of knowledge exists and cannot be altered. The decision-making process must be retained at the community level and, therefore, I would insist that NIE not be involved in this phase of the educational operation.

Over the years it has appeared to me that the purpose of public education has been altered from that of a specific service to one that encompasses a variety of opportunities. Inasmuch as the school year for elementary and secondary is between 180 and 200 days, the student has a minimum opportunity to come in contact with the instructor. Since the federal program thrust of the 1960's, many new programs have been superimposed upon the public schools and namely upon the same child during the same period of time.

In some quarters the purpose of education appears to be the economic rather than the educational impact, and it is not uncommon for unsuccessful programs to be continued because the job loss might have a serious effect upon the local economy. As evidence I submit that at the San Francisco meeting of the Education Commission of the States, Governor Rampton, Leroy Greene, etc., commented at a seminar about the mass of data collected by the USOE which has never been opened. Further, it was stated that in order to continue the authorization letters have been sent to school districts commending programs that have never been evaluated. Therefore, we can conclude that the business of education is big and the public school student must support a major industry.

As the older population grows and the school enrollment declines, we witness the emergence of new programs designed for the same child during the same period of time without lengthening the school day. Inasmuch as school support is based to a great extent upon formulas that are student-driven, those with a vested interest in this business want to obtain as much as possible from the child as he speeds by the twelve years of school.

As was noted by some of the participants in the Washington conference, we continue to add and add without taking into account the time. I believe Dr. Dulce touched upon the issue of "time" but did not elaborate.

It is now virtually impossible to determine a true pupil-teacher ratio because we have Titles I, III, IV, VI and VII, Right-to-Read, ESA, JOM, Migrant, Follow Through, Resource Rooms, etc., etc., all superimposed upon the same student who is listed as an "entitlement" for every program. The same student is counted for the same period of time in the state aid computation, and it is supposed to be for a full day's opportunity. On the surface it might appear that school districts will accept any task as long as it receives a cost differential or cash. If the school enrollment declines, I forecast the issue will become more pronounced and we will wonder why districts go from a six-year textbook adoption cycle to four and why definitions are broadened to encompass all of the remaining children into special programs.

Whenever questions of this type are raised, we rarely obtain a fair response. It is impossible for the educational community to evaluate itself just as it is comical to have the federal arm of a particular program assess the worth of its counterpart in a local district. Contracts to other educational organizations have been attempted but as long as the provider has a vested interest in the program we can be assured that the program is "successful" before it is even assessed.

Is there an organization that can report directly to the executive, the legislative and the people as to the status of public education? Perhaps this should

be a mission of the National Institute of Education. In my opinion, the NIE should dedicate itself toward finding out what happened to cause the test scores to drop simultaneously on a nationwide basis and not get involved in establishing another layer of bureaucratic relief. I don't think there's anything more foolish than a comment from a U. S. Commissioner of Education, upon finding out that reading achievement has declined, that what we need now is a right-to-read program. The NIE should find out what happened.

The only items I would recommend that should be considered for research and development might be particular programs designed to test whether or not our time frame for public education might require some alternatives. For example, why five days of school? -- why not four? -- and the fifth to be used on a formal basis by the instructor for planning and evaluation. Perhaps ninety high-quality days would provide a more appropriate educational opportunity than one hundred and eighty bad days. A pilot of this type would be excellent as long as NIE had complete control and also pledged to assess its value in an honest fashion. Otherwise, the innovation would join the ranks of the other superimposed federal programs and would be added to the layers of bureaucracy and accepted by the local school district as long as money and jobs were made available for its employees.

I hope that what I have written will be of some value to you. I honestly believe that we do not have an organization at present that has embarked upon an honest and fair appraisal of the status of public education today, and I hope that this is the type of challenge that the NIE might assume in the area of curriculum.

Incidentally, I also have some strong views relative to NIE's involvement in other areas, such as school finance reforms, etc.; however, inasmuch as the Washington conference was primarily dedicated to curriculum, I do not wish to confuse the issue.

Thanks again for inviting me. I enjoyed the conference very much, and if I can be of any other service at any time, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Harry Wugalter
Secretary for Education

HW/tp

Lawrence Senesh
December 5, 1976

Recommendations of Lawrence Senesh

for

National Institute of Education

1. Individual innovators or team of innovators who can make contributions in the field of conceptualizing knowledge and who can relate knowledge meaningfully to the life experiences of youth at different age levels.

2. Innovators or team of innovators who can build the bridge between social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities.

3. Innovators who will help youth develop future awareness.

4. Teams of scholars and educators who will develop new teacher training designs to meet the dynamic changes in society caused by science, technology, and changing value preferences.

5. Innovative projects which bring together different grant-giving agencies to work as a team and not as rivals.

6. Establishment of twenty regional educational centers which will serve as yardstick operations for a social science system-based curriculum. These centers could coordinate the following tasks:

   a. Preparation of social profiles of the home communities and communities to which the youth may migrate.

   b. Training of educational and community leaders to use these social profiles for educational decision-making.

   c. Identification of opportunities for work and citizenship experiences which will encourage students to identify with the community.

   d. Training of teachers to translate educational goals of the community into the classroom.

   e. Building of feed-back channels to the state universities and other teacher-training institutions so that these institutions can keep up-to-date with the needs of the community.

   f. Bringing together of the best brains in the area to keep track of the dynamic changes in the home community as well as in communities relevant to the youths' future.

g. Demonstrations of creative classroom activities and distribution of information of such activities in writing and in regional in-service programs. Much creative teaching takes place in classrooms throughout the country, but there is no communication system nor reward system.

h. Development of manuals and readings for members of the community to help them understand better the purposes of education and innovations, and also to help them to develop a long-range outlook necessary for educational decision-making.

i. Development of evaluating mechanisms to measure social competence.

j. Establishment of a clearing house of information on new curriculum development and creative classroom practices for the twenty educational centers.

k. Establishment of continuing dialogue between schools and communities on the purposes of education and the need for harmonizing goals and curriculum.

7. Creative minds but not confining them to the letter of the guidelines. Too often the guidelines discourage innovators and encourage the grantsmen.

8. Graduate programs in which science educators are trained to integrate the disciplines and teaching strategies.

9. Support of in-service training programs with the sole purpose of closing the gap between the frontiers of knowledge and the curriculum.

10. Support for developing new teacher-training design which will:
coordinate conceptualization of knowledge and methodology;
assure continuity from grades 1 - 12;
train teachers to adjust nationally prepared materials to local situations;
enable school administrators to read community social profiles from which they can construct educational goals;
enable school administrators to interpret the goals of education to meet the need of a dynamic society.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

November 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ralph Tyler and Jon Schaffarzick, NIE

FROM: Marjorie Gardner

RE: Thoughts on Federal Agency Roles in Curriculum Development

Government agencies such as NIE must provide leadership in Curriculum Development. School districts do not have time, talent or resources to do all of their Curriculum Development work locally. Instead, they should invest energies in deciding which of the array of available alternatives to use; setting up options to satisfy varying teacher, student (and parent) needs within their school; adapting and implementing and producing some curriculum materials with local character (site specific) to complement generic curricula developed under sponsorship of federal agencies or commercial enterprises.

NIE and other federal agencies can provide leadership in Curriculum Development through the following activities:

1. Funding groups that have the potential to develop excellent generic materials so that an array of up-to-date, alternative curricula will be available to school systems throughout the nation.

2. Disseminating information on successful models for implementation of curricula in a local system (e.g. Minneapolis public schools, Fairfax County, Virginia public schools).

3. Reviving something akin to the NDEA so that more money is available for the purchase and maintainence of supplies, equipment and AV on a matching basis with state and local systems.

4. Funding research on curriculum development, curriculum implementation, and curriculum evaluation.

5. Searching for effective mechanisms for communicating research findings and for integrating curriculum research with curriculum development.

6. Funding (on a matching fund basis) innovative site specific curricula, this might also include resources for consultant help from experienced curriculum innovators.

7. Working toward an effective, non-hierarchical partnership of federal, state and local, and private sectors in curriculum development.

Federal--generic development

Local--site specific choice, modification and implementation of generic curricula; some local development

Private sector--publishing, manufacturing and marketing

8. Recognizing teacher training as a continuous part of a person's professional development and helping to fund continuing education with respect to curriculum decision making, implementation and evaluation; also a continuous strengthening and up-dating of subject matter backgrounds is essential.

9. Funding teacher education curriculum development projects; this may be the most important curriculum development work NIE could fund. Stimulate research and development of new modes of teaching and testing. The teacher and the test, which ultimately determine the curriculum, have been neglected in the past. NIE is an appropriate agency to tackle these, but search for rational risk takers, highly talented and innovative performers. Attract the best and the brightest.

10. Sponsoring an interagency commission similar to the one that operated in the early 60's to rationally divide responsibility and funding, conserve resources, and promote cooperation.

MG:cn

Public
Education
Association

20 West 40th Street
New York, New York 10018
(212) 354-6100

OFFICERS
President/Chairman Board of Trustees
John Saunders

Vice-Presidents
Mrs. Ralph F. Colin, Jr.
Mrs. Raymond Z. Fahs, Jr.

Treasurer
Mrs. John H. Loeb

Honorary Trustees
Mrs. Alvan L. Barach
Mrs. Shirley C. Fisk
Mrs. Victor W. Ganz
Frank E. Karelsen
Marjorie G. Lewisohn, M.D.
Mrs. Richard O. Loengard
Mrs. J. Lawrence Pool
Bethuel M. Webster

TRUSTEES
Luis Alvarez
Terence H. Benbow
Mrs. Stephanie H. Bernheim
Ms. Evelyn Colon
Mrs. Ana Conigliaro
Carl E. Flemister
Mrs. J. Peter Flemming
Edmund W. Gordon
Mrs. David L. Guyer
Mrs. Bernard Haber
Edward Howard
William Josephson
Mrs. Rhoda H. Karpatkin
Irving Lipkowitz
Mrs. Henry A. Loeb
Charles F. Luce
Hon. Georgia L. McMurray
Mrs. Stanley G. Mortimer, Jr.
Joseph A. Mulholland
Jack John Olivero
Ms. Awilda Orta
J. Robert Pigott
Bertrand B. Pogrebin
Mrs. Elsie Richardson
Mrs. Francis B. Roth
Mrs. Arnold Salpeter
Charles E. Silberman
Joshua L. Smith
Mrs. Leo Stern, Jr.
Lloyd B. Taft
Mrs. Nancy S. Ticktin
Mrs. Charlotte B. Winsor

STAFF
Director
David S. Seeley

December 1, 1976

Mr. Jon Schaffarzick
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Mr. Schaffarzick:

I am sorry I had to leave the curriculum policy meeting so early; it looked like it was getting into interesting issues. I hope they were pursued, and that the three day session met with your expectations.

One issue of particular importance that began to emerge at the Thursday morning session (it came up in earlier sessions as well) is this: To what extent is NIE willing to view its mission, in terms of curriculum policy as well as other policies, in the context of the broad definition of "education" put forth by Ralph Tyler and agreed to by most participants: namely that a great deal of a child's education takes place outside of school.

It is all very well for a Ralph Tyler to remind us of this truism, and for us all to nod in agreement. But the fact is that in many ways we conduct our educational enterprise on the opposite premise. One of the answers to the question "what are children learning?" is that education is supposed to take place almost exclusively in school, at the hands of certified, "professional" teachers. They are learning this lesson because we in the educational business are teaching it to them--perhaps unconsciously. Even the NIE signals this message when its curriculum projects are confined almost exclusively to what happens in schools.

This does not automatically prove that NIE should not focus primarily upon the schools, but it does mean that NIE's policies may be unconsciously contributing to this unintended "lesson" that all education takes place in schools. The NIE is after all, a national institute of <u>education</u>, not a national institute of <u>schools</u>.

I think it would be a healthy development if the NIE would consider intensively the implications of the important insight put on the table by Ralph Tyler for the possible regearing of its own policies. I, for one, am convinced that we cannot solve even the narrower problems of school effectiveness except within the broader context of the educational effectiveness of the broader society. By this I emphatically do not mean that schools should be allowed to "cop out," for instance, by saying they cannot educate poor children because their broader educational context (family life, street culture, etc.) makes it impossible. I do mean, however, that we have to look at schools far more in terms of their relationship to their surrounding context than we have been doing. We have to understand the limitations of schooling in order to develop strategies wherein schools can have a more powerful effect than they now do by relating more integrally to the total educational context of the child.

One little example from the session I had to leave in the middle of: One of the participants told the heartrending story of some people in New York City who had died in a fire because they did not know how to evacuate their apartment building. The context of the discussion suggested that the school curriculum should therefore be expanded to include fire emergency procedures. Fair enough; it is logical conclusion--for people who assume that all learning must take place in schools. But could we not consider alternatives, such as training people on each block who would perform these "teaching" functions, perhaps as part of a more general community development and education strategy that also included public safety, sanitation, day care, etc.? Impractical, you might say. And in the meantime many people will burn to death because we failed to impart this essential learning in school, where we already have a social organization which can take on this responsibility and trained teachers who can carry it out. But we are also learning, are we not, the monumental "impracticality" of this approach? Children will never learn all they need to know if we keep thinking it all has to be learned in school. We will bankrupt the school system trying (it may not take teachers costing $25,000 a year to teach fire drills, and they may be much less effective when taught in the abstract rather than in the buildings in which they must be practiced), and the schools will neglect the main mission they can perform effectively, namely academic skills and understanding.

If NIE would consciously broaden its concept to include "education" rather than schooling, perhaps a number of issues would take on a different cast. In some ways your problems will be more complex, but I am convinced that your contributions to education will be more fruitful.

Please send me any conclusions on reports growing out of the conference. I have enclose a copy of an article I have just done for the City Almanac that will give you a more systematic treatment of some of the points I made at the meeting.

Sincerely yours,

David S. Seeley
Director

DSS/fm

NIE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE - NOVEMBER 17-19, 1976

Closing suggestions from participants - J, Lloyd Trump
National Association of Secondary
School Principals

The NIE would make a major contribution to the schools of this country, as a first step, by mounting and guiding a project to develop guidlines - and then specifics - of the basic knowledge, skills, and selected aspects in the affective domains that everyone in this country needs. Then the states and other locales hopefully would make decisions to accept the program and get on with developing curricula concerned with hobbies and careers appropriate for their levels.

These steps are fundamental in making curriculum more relevant for everyone. The point is that today's schools everywhere require more content and skills than everyone needs and with little differentiation among groups except as some students fail or drop out, or at least are discouraged about lack of relevancy for them. What may be even worse, many students fail to discover hobbies and careers that are good for them.

The idea is not new. A few states in the 1930s and 1940s tried this approach but had little external help or support. Historically, a number of individuals and local schools have done the same thing. The task is too big for them. The NIE could help. There would then be better bases for choices at state and local levels.

NIE should also lead in developing better techniques for evaluation -- both of individual pupil progress and the total program of the school. The goals would be to provide better data than schools now possess for diagnoses and prescriptions of alternative programs to implement. Hopefully this approach would attack basically the major purposes of present evaluation efforts that aim mostly to compare one individual with another, one program with another, or one institution with another. This second aim could be an outcome but it must be subordinated to the first.

Related to both of the foregoing proposals for the NIE to consider, is the need to help school people -- and especially the lay public -- to understand that programs to produce more individualization for teachers and pupils require more planning, more structure, and more comprehensive evaluation than conventional schools provide.

The foregoing suggestions have many ramifications. They are especially appropriate for the NIE in curriculum development because they are not aimed at national programs but rather to provide help for states and localities.

Discussion: Who is currently doing what in curriculum development?

From the vantage point of one school district where systematic, cooperative curriculum planning has not been done, let me dilineate who is involved in curriculum development.

1. Special Interest Groups Dictating Curriculum Content

   - Right to Life Groups
   - Planned Parenthood Groups
   - Environmentalists
   - Commercial interests which sponsor competitive activities (essay and poetry contests)

2. Federal Programs

   - ESEA Title I in Reading and Math
   - Emergency School Assistance Act in Reading and Math
   - Special Programs for Native Americans and Refugees

3. School Board Members with Pet Projects

   - Sex Education (Pro and Con)
   - Free Enterprise System

4. Ethnic Groups

5. The Media

6. Parents

7. Teachers

8. Administrators

9. Students

No one would argue that each of the above-named groups has a valid role in curriculum decision-making. However, the lack of vehicles to appropriately involve these segments will lead to a gradual erosion of the role of the professional educator in the curriculum development process. School Systems need help in developing such vehicles.

Elizabeth S. Randolph
Assistant Superintendent, Zone II
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Charlotte North Carolina

Judy Herman
December 3, 1976

Suggestions to NIE Curriculum Development Task Force

NIE should:

1. Broadly disseminate existing information about curriculum if such information is not already available. Such information should be organized so that it is accessible to laypeople. NIE might make it more useful if NIE staff notes similarities, duplications, and parallels in the available materials.

2. Assume responsibility for research if such research is not being carried out by local, state, or the private sector. Research should include: evaluation of existing curriculum materials; identifying evidence of existing curriculum's impact on students; identifying deficiencies of the existing curriculum; and extending study of the learning process in order to understand the impact of curriculum.

3. Assume responsibility for curriculum development if such development cannot be carried out effectively by the local, state, or private sector so that:

   a. Alternatives are provided. In some cases such alternatives will include parents, teachers, and/or "experts" in the development of curriculum materials.

      The teachers with whom I work use a variety of materials which include many manipulative materials and few textbooks. They choose the most effective teaching tools depending upon the children with whom they work.

   b. Alternatives include locally developed curriculum. The funding for the Bicentennial seemed to encourage the development of many worthwhile local history programs. These should be continued and their impact and success evaluated. Similar programs might be initiated at the local level.

   c. Historic sites, museums, zoos, and other local institutions which are potential academic environments are used more extensively. An effective working relationship between schools and such non-school institutions should be encouraged.

Such institutions offer resources for teachers who want to develop curriculum. Their education staff can help teachers develop curriculum using such resources.

d. New curriculum is implemented so that teachers are given enough lead time and training to use the materials.

e. Any curriculum presently being developed or developed in the future is evaluated.

4. If NIE provides grants for curriculum development, there should be competition for obtaining them and people should be informed that such grants exist.

APPENDIX D

NIE CURRICULUM POLICY SUMMARY

NIE wants to know what you think about the policy alternatives it is considering on each topic covered by the yellow discussion guides accompanying this summary. Each discussion guide contains background information and arguments for and against each policy alternative. After carefully studying each yellow guide and forming an opinion, write, telephone, or--if you prefer--simply indicate your views on this summary and mail it to us soon so that your opinions can be considered. If you have a better alternative than the ones shown in this summary, write your own in the margins.

(1) HOW SHOULD NIE DEFINE "CURRICULUM"?

See Discussion Guide 1

The term "curriculum" means different things to different people. Check or write what it does mean to you. Then check or write what it should mean to NIE. Your responses may not be the same.

MY OWN DEFINITION OF CURRICULUM (check one or more)	WHAT NIE'S DEFINITION OF CURRICULUM SHOULD BE (check one or more)	WHAT DOES "CURRICULUM" MEAN TO YOU? WHAT SHOULD IT MEAN TO NIE?
☐	☐	1. What is taught: *the information, the substantive content, the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values students are to learn.*
☐	☐	2. How it is taught: *the instructional methods teachers use--individualization, grouping, class discussions, lectures, laborabory work, homework, etc.*
☐	☐	3. Teachers' materials: *curriculum guides, syllabi, courses of study, bibliographies, lists of resource materials, lists of resource personnel, etc.*
☐	☐	4. Students' materials: *testbooks, workbooks, films, tapes, equipment, supplies, etc.*
☐	☐	5. School experiences: *all learning experiences, influenced but not determined solely by the content and methods teachers use.*
☐	☐	6. All experiences: *all learning experiences, not only in school but also outside of school--influenced but not determined solely by what the school itself does.*
☐	☐	7. The combination *of definitions checked above.*
☐	☐	8. None of the above. *"Curriculum" is* _____

NIE Curriculum Development Task Force
Chairman: Jon Schaffarzick, 202-254-5706
National Institute of Education, Room 815, 1200 19th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20208
Prepared for NIE by Policy Studies in Education, New York, New York

② SHOULD NIE DEVELOP NEW CURRICULA?

See Discussion Guide 2

School curricula must change to keep up with new scholarly knowledge and with social and economic trends.

WHAT SHOULD NIE DO ABOUT DEVELOPING NEW CURRICULA?
(Check one or two alternatives.)

☐ 1. Nothing. NIE should leave their development entirely to others.

☐ 2. Stimulate others. NIE should stimulate others to develop new curricula by pointing to the need, giving evidence of its importance, projecting the number of users, and suggesting what types of curricula might be developed in what manner at what cost on what time schedule for what potential market.

☐ 3. Create new approaches. NIE should create better approaches to curriculum development (models, principles, guidelines, manuals, examples of good practice) to help others.

☐ 4. Create new examples. NIE should develop illustrative but unfinished curricula (concepts, designs, short curricular units, sample teacher guides, exemplary pupil materials) and allow others to expand them into full-fledged curricula.

☐ 5. Offer training and technical assistance to help others. NIE should offer training (in selecting and organizing substantive content, writing performance objectives, selecting teaching methods, designing teachers' guides, developing pupil materials) and technical assistance (consultation, critiques, lists of experts in substantive content and instructional methods, etc.) to help others.

☐ 6. Develop new curricula. NIE should perform all the steps necessary to develop new curricula, doing everything from formulating the designs through producing complete descriptions of instructional activities and complete publishable packages of all necessary teacher materials and student materials.

☐ 7. None of the above. NIE should: _____

_____

_____

③ SHOULD NIE EVALUATE NEW CURRICULA?

See Discussion Guide 3

WHAT SHOULD NIE DO ABOUT EVALUATING ANY NEW CURRICULA IT DEVELOPS? WHAT SHOULD NIE DO ABOUT EVALUATING ANY NEW CURRICULA OTHERS DEVELOP?
(Check one or two alternatives.)

☐ 1. Nothing. NIE should stay out of curriculum evaluation.

☐ 2. Stimulate others. NIE should stimulate others to evaluate new curricula by publishing lists of promising but unevaluated programs, explaining the need to evaluate them, and suggesting alternative approaches and instruments and analyses and interpretations that might be employed.

☐ 3. Construct new approaches. NIE should create better schemes of evaluation (models, principles, examples of excellent evaluations) to guide others in developing instruments and techniques.

☐ 4. Create new instruments and techniques. NIE should create instruments (tests, interview schedules, observation guides, etc.) and techniques (statistical methods, report formats, etc.) for others to use.

☐ 5. Offer training and technical assistance. NIE should offer training (in evaluation theory, evaluation design, instrument development, data analysis, data interpretation, report writing) and technical assistance (instruments, techniques, advice, critiques, names of consultants, summaries of previous evaluations) to help others.

☐ 6. Evaluate NIE curricula. NIE should perform actual evaluations of any new curricula created by NIE, beginning with the choice of methodology and ending with published reports of findings.

☐ 7. Evaluate other curricula. NIE should perform actual evaluations of new curricula created by others, beginning with the choice of methodology and ending with published reports of findings.

☐ 8. None of the above. NIE should: _____

_____

_____

④ SHOULD NIE HELP IMPLEMENT NEW CURRICULA?

See Discussion Guide 4

The best designed new curricula have no value whatever to students unless they are properly implemented.

IF NIE DEVELOPS NEW CURRICULA, WHAT SHOULD IT DO ABOUT MOVING THEM INTO USE BY THE SCHOOLS?

(Check one or two alternatives.)

☐ 1. Nothing. NIE should make no attempt to get its products used.

☐ 2. Supply information. NIE should offer information (descriptive brochures, illustrative lessons, sample test items) about its new curricula but should play an essentially passive role even at that and should go no further.

☐ 3. Encourage others. NIE should encourage others to help schools use its products. Encouragement can come in the form of announcing their availability, explaining the problems and opportunities they address, and suggesting what kinds of information, assistance, and training teachers might need to use them.

☐ 4. Arrange for publication. NIE should arrange for publication of its curricular materials, offering attractive copyrights and accepting modest royalties to promote their widespread distribution.

☐ 5. Offer training and technical assistance. NIE should provide training (either in how to use its specific products or in how to use new products of the same type) to help institutions and classroom teachers implement them.

☐ 6. Promote NIE curricula. NIE should offer the full range of implementation supports needed to promote the spread of its new curricula, taking every necessary step from announcing their availability through arranging the publication of their curricular materials to training teachers in how to use them.

☐ 7. Build selectivity rather than building demand. What NIE should create among consumers is not a desire for its products but instead the ability to choose products intelligently. It should publish guides to help consumers choose products, suggest techniques for small-scale pilot evaluations before massive implementation, discuss what kinds of products work best in what circumstances when used by what teachers with what students.

☐ 8. None of the above. NIE should: _____

_____

_____

⑤ WHO SHOULD PLAN CURRICULUM ACTIVITIES WITH NIE?

See Discussion Guide 5

NIE cannot solve all curricular problems. There are more potentially valuable curriculum activities than NIE can undertake. Therefore, NIE must plan its activities very carefully.

WHEN NIE PLANS ITS ACTIVITIES, WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED AND HOW SHOULD NIE SOLICIT THEIR VIEWS?

(Pick the one best method for each group, or suggest better methods, or suggest additional groups.)

METHOD

1. No need to involve this group
2. Commission papers
3. Poll by mail
4. Poll by telephone
5. Convene meetings
6. Attend meetings already scheduled
7. Other (please specify)

_____

_____

GROUP
(Enter method numbers in boxes)

- ☐ College and university scholars
- ☐ Classroom teachers
- ☐ Parents and citizens
- ☐ Leaders of professional associations and unions
- ☐ Leaders of parents and citizens groups, labor unions, and employers
- ☐ Curriculum specialists in state education agencies and local education agencies
- ☐ Curriculum development organizations
- ☐ Publishers
- ☐ Other (please specify)_____

_____

⑥ HOW MUCH CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP SHOULD NIE EXERT?

See Discussion Guide 6

NIE can act either as an active leader or as a passive follower in the curriculum field.

HOW MUCH INITIATIVE SHOULD NIE EXERT IN CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES?
(Choose one of these two alternatives or write your own.)

☐ 1. None at all. Instead, NIE should respond to the initiatives of other agencies, organizations, and groups.

To which of the following should NIE be particularily responsive?

- ☐ Other government agencies
  - ☐ other Federal Agencies
  - ☐ state agencies
  - ☐ local agencies
- ☐ Major national organizations and associations
  - ☐ professional
  - ☐ parents, citizens' groups, labor unions, employers, etc.
- ☐ Neglected minority populations who have exhausted local and state sources of assistance.
  - ☐ blacks
  - ☐ women
  - ☐ poverty groups

☐ 2. NIE should initiate action under certain conditions.

- ☐ When the needed curriculum improvement is a matter of clear national importance.
- ☐ When NIE can enlist the active endorsement of major national organizations or leaders of minority populations.
- ☐ When other school districts such as state education departments and local education agencies have not done so.

☐ 3. None of the above. NIE should: _____

_____

(7) WHO SHOULD PERFORM CURRICULUM ACTIVITIES FOR NIE?

See Discussion Guide 7

NIE is a funding agency. Whatever NIE wants done, someone else must do. erhaps the most significant decisions NIE makes are its choices of performers.

HOM SHOULD NIE FUND TO DO WHAT?

(Choose one or two performer(s) for each curriculum activity and enter their number(s) beside that activity.)

POSSIBLE PERFORMERS	CURRICULUM ACTIVITY (Enter performer numbers in boxes)
1. Local school districts	
2. Intermediate school service agencies	
3. State education departments	
4. Federal education agencies	☐☐ Developing New Curricula
5. Nonpublic elementary or secondary schools	
6. Colleges and universities	
7. Regional educational laboratories	☐☐ Evaluating New Curricula
8. University-based research and development centers	
9. Professional associations and unions	
10. Independent non-profit organizations	☐☐ Supporting Implementation of New Curricula
11. Publishers	
12. Other (please specify)	☐☐ Other (please specify)
_____	_____
_____	_____

⑧ SHOULD NIE EMPHASIZE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, OR IMPLEMENTATION?

See Discussion Guide 8

HOW SHOULD NIE DIVIDE ITS EFFORTS AMONG CONDUCTING RESEARCH, DEVELOPING NEW PRODUCTS, AND SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION?

(The table below shows what NIE is doing currently. How should this table be changed, if at all, for the next 3 years? Allocate 100 percentage points.)

Activity	The Present Balance	A Better Balance
Conducting Research	15%	☐
Developing New Products	70%	☐
Supporting Implementation	15%	☐
	100%	100% ⇦ Must Total 100%

⑨ HOW SHOULD NIE DIVIDE ITS DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS?

See Discussion Guide 9

Development can be thought of as inventing, creating, or producing new variations in substantive content, teaching methods, instructional materials, techniques of selecting and grouping students, school schedules, school facilities, teacher training, or other aspects of schooling. To which of these, or to what combination, should NIE devote its efforts?

HOW SHOULD NIE DIVIDE ITS DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS?

(Allocate 100 percentage points.)

Areas for Development	Recommended Division of Effort
New Substantive Content	☐
New Instructional Methods	☐
New Instructional Materials	☐
New Techniques of Selecting and Grouping Students	☐
New Ways of Scheduling Instruction ,ping Students	☐
New Designs for School Facilities	☐
New Methods of Teacher Training	☐
Other:_____	☐
	100% ⇦ Must total 100%

⑩ WHAT TYPES OF NEW CURRICULA SHOULD NIE DEVELOP?

See Discussion Guide 10

NIE must make decisions about the types of curricula it will develop.

WHAT TYPES OF CURRICULA SHOULD NIE DEVELOP?
(For each topic below, choose one or two areas in which NIE should concentrate.)

● 1. Student Population
Check one or two
- ☐ Normal
- ☐ Gifted
- ☐ Handicapped
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Poverty
- ☐ Ethnic
- ☐ Other _____

● 2. Grade and Level of School
Check one or two categories and one or two choices in each
- ☐ Pre-School, Ages 3-5
  - ☐ Nursery School
  - ☐ Kindergarten
- ☐ Elementary Education, Ages 6-11
  - ☐ Primary Grades 1-3
  - ☐ Intermediate Grades 4-6
- ☐ Secondary Education, Ages 12-17
  - ☐ Junior High School
  - ☐ Senior High School
  - ☐ Vocational School
- ☐ Postsecondary Education, Ages 18-26
  - ☐ 2-year Institutions
  - ☐ 4-year Institutions
  - ☐ Technical Institutes
  - ☐ Professional Schools
  - ☐ Post-Graduate Studies
- ☐ Adult Education, Ages 27 and Up
  - ☐ 2-year Institutions
  - ☐ 4-year Institutions
  - ☐ Technical Institutes
  - ☐ Professional Schools
  - ☐ Post-Graduate Studies
- ☐ Other _____

● 3. Type of School
Check one or two
- ☐ Public
- ☐ Parochial
- ☐ Private
- ☐ Proprietary
- ☐ Other _____

● 4. Demographic Setting
Check one or two
- ☐ Urban
- ☐ Suburban
- ☐ Rural
- ☐ Other _____

● 5. Subject Field
Check one or two
- ☐ Art
- ☐ Business and Office Education
- ☐ Driver Education
- ☐ Foreign Languages
- ☐ Health Education
- ☐ Home Economics
- ☐ Industrial Arts
- ☐ Language Arts/Reading/English
- ☐ Mathematics
- ☐ Music
- ☐ Physical Education
- ☐ Science
- ☐ Social Studies
- ☐ Special Education
- ☐ Distributive Education
- ☐ Trades and Industry
- ☐ Vocational Agriculture
- ☐ Other _____

● 6. Type of Behavior
Check one or two
- ☐ Knowing (cognitive)
- ☐ Feeling (affective)
- ☐ Performing (psychomotor)
- ☐ Other _____

● 7. Organization of Substantive Content
Check one or two
- ☐ Subject-centered
- ☐ Problem-oriented
- ☐ Other _____

● 8. Diversity of Curricula
Check one or two
- ☐ Many different curricula
- ☐ Single best curriculum
- ☐ Other _____

● 9. Another topic for NIE to consider and my recommendations for focus:

_____

PLEASE COMPLETE

If you choose to indicate your views on this summary and mail it to us, we will understand your opinions better if you respond to these two items. No need to sign your name, however.

1. ARE YOU A (check one)

☐ 1. Professional educator

1. If so, are you a

☐ 1. Teacher or professor
☐ 2. Specialist
☐ 3. Administrator
☐ 4. Other (please specify) _____

2. Please identify your current

1. Subject area(s) taught _____
2. Grade level(s) taught _____
3. National professional association membership(s) _____

☐ 2. Parent
☐ 3. Interested citizen
☐ 4. Other (please specify) _____

2. IS YOUR EMPLOYER A (check one)

☐ 1. Local school district
☐ 2. Intermediate school service agency
☐ 3. State education department
☐ 4. Federal education agency
☐ 5. Nonpublic elementary or secondary school
☐ 6. College or university
☐ 7. Regional educational laboratory
☐ 8. University-based research and development center
☐ 10. Independent non-profit organization
☐ 11. Publisher
☐ 12. Other (please specify) _____

IF YOU WISH TO MAIL YOUR VIEWS TO NIE, WRITE TO:

Jon Schaffarzick, Chairman
NIE Curriculum Development Task Force
National Institute of Education
Room 815, 1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208